




LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case, ... Division, ...
Shelf, ... Section, ...
Book, ... No.

BV

811

.M322

1828

v. 1



A DISCUSSION
OF
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM,
AS TO
ITS SUBJECT, ITS MODE, ITS HISTORY,
AND ITS EFFECTS UPON
CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS SOCIETY.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE VIEWS OF
MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL,
AS EXPRESSED IN A SEVEN DAYS' DEBATE WITH THE AUTHOR, AT
WASHINGTON, KENTUCKY, OCTOBER, 1823,
AND IN HIS SPURIOUS PUBLICATION OF THAT DEBATE.
AND OF A PREVIOUS ONE, OF TWO DAYS, WITH THE
REV. JOHN WALKER, OF OHIO.

AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE VIEWS OF THE CELEBRATED
MR. ROBINSON, AND OTHER BAPTIST AUTHORS.
IN TWO VOLUMES.

BY W. L. M'CALLA,

*Pastor of the Eighth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and
author of "A Discussion of Universalism."*

VOL. I.

Philadelphia :

PUBLISHED BY GEORGE M'LAUGHLIN.

.....
1828.

Eastern District of Pennsylvania, to wit:

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on the seventh day of August, in the fifty third year of the independence of the United States of America, A. D. 1823, W. L. McCalla, of the said District, hath deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as author, in the words following, to wit:

“A Discussion of Christian Baptism, as to its subject, its mode, its history, and its effects upon civil and religious society. In opposition to the views of Mr. Alexander Campbell, as expressed in a seven days’ debate with the author, at Washington, Kentucky, October, 1823, and in his spurious publication of that Debate, and of a previous one of two days with the Rev. John Walker, of Ohio. And in opposition to the views of the celebrated Mr. Robinson, and other Baptist authors. In two volumes. By W. L. McCalla, Pastor of the Eighth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and author of ‘A Discussion of Universalism.’”

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, intituled, “An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies, during the times therein mentioned;—And also to the Act, entitled, “An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies during the times therein mentioned,” and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints,”

D. CALDWELL,

Clerk of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PREFACE.

IN consequence of a general challenge, long published by Mr. Alexander Campbell, and at last accepted by the Author, a debate was held in Washington, Kentucky, in October, 1823, on Christian Baptism. With the expectation that it would last three hours, or a day at most, Mr. Campbell came prepared with a printed prospectus, promising that "All the arguments on both sides shall be faithfully and impartially *detailed*." As there was no stenographer, a detailed report was literally impossible; and, as the debate occupied seven days, instead of one, a detailed report would have been a losing, instead of a lucrative enterprise. He therefore published 6000 copies of the promised volume, in which all the speeches were composed by one man, in such a way as to answer the purpose of one party. Providence enabled me afterward to expose this forgery, in an Octavo volume of 150 pages, entitled "The Unitarian Baptist of the Robinson School exposed." To this he replied in a Duodecimo of 24 pages. An exposure of this pamphlet, and of the book which it is intended to support, is prefixed to the argument in this volume.

The public are already informed that want of time compelled me to omit, in the debate, much matter which had been prepared for it. This need not be suppressed in a printed publication. As Mr. Campbell's report has taken the liberty of making new speeches, in part, for himself, as well as entirely new ones for me, I shall, when necessary, answer such interpolations, or, at any time, strengthen the cause of truth, by introducing new matter on my part, and by very freely condensing the matter delivered on the stage.

As the audience who attended the debate was chiefly composed of plain men, so it is my wish to adapt this publication to the plainer class of readers. This may account for some things which would otherwise appear very incorrect. One of these things is, that all my references to the Bible are made to suit that division of chapters and verses which is found in our English Translation, although hundreds of those references are professedly made to the Hebrew and Septuagint Scriptures. Without this method, ordinary readers would be utterly perplexed, in searching authorities, whereas, those of better opportunities need be at no great loss by the adoption of this plan. In quoting uninspired works, whether ancient or modern, second-hand authorities are often more accessible than originals. To the use of them, both parties were compelled, in a great measure, by necessity, during the debate; and where the credit of the reporters is untouched and almost intangible, the plan may be sometimes continued in this publication. Detections of errors will be thankfully received.

If my friends and the friends of truth knew the difficulty with which I write, they would no longer censure me for unavoidable delays, but help me to give thanks to that God, whose mercy has enabled me to progress thus far in the work. To him it is sincerely and solemnly dedicated. May he be pleased to accept the humble offering; to pardon its faults and imperfections, through the atoning blood of the divine Redeemer; and to grant the influence of his divine Spirit, to bless that portion of truth which it contains, to the good of all denominations.

MR. CAMPBELL'S LATE PAMPHLET.

It is amusing to observe the time and labour which Mr. Campbell and his testifying satellites have spent, in assigning to him and his Antagonist, their respective grades in the scale of talents ; without being able to come to any certain estimate, at last. If I were in his place, it seems to me, that I could settle this darling question, upon a firm basis in a few words. I would sit down and write a certificate declaring that Alexander Campbell was a Solomon, and that his Antagonist was a Simpleton. This certificate should be signed by Alexander Campbell himself, and by a competent number of NEUTRAL Unitarians and Baptists, and *Non-professing* sons and brothers of Baptists and Baptist preachers. If it were then published without another word about the matter, it would save the party and his witnesses, from the unhappy appearance of inconsistency and self-complacency which they now assume. At present they certify that he could change sides and beat me ; whereas he says that he did once advocate my side, and was overcome by an old woman. During the debate, he often represented me as incompetent and inadequate to the task which I had undertaken ; in his book written afterward, he represented me as *competent* and *adequate* : in his late pamphlet his witnesses certify that I am incompetent and inadequate ; yet in the same pamphlet he extols my defence so far as to say that “ nothing better has ever been said, and nothing better can be said,” on my side of the question. After thus exalting me to a level with any Pedobaptist who ever wrote, he gets three of his witnesses to certify, that “ Mr. Campbell was successful in argument, and greatly the superior of Mr. McCalla in point of talents.” Therefore, of course, he is greatly superior to any Pedobaptist who ever wrote.

As an apology for this strange proceeding, in a man of common sense, he would have the community believe, that it is only a retaliation upon me, for claiming a superiority of talents over him. If I have ever done so, it has entirely escaped my memory. Nothing but inexcusable pride and ignorance could ever have led me into such folly. My innocence of the charge is plain, from the fact that my accuser has not been able to give one instance, in which this offence has been committed. It is true, I have claimed the victory in the debate; and I believe that a judicious community will admit my claims, when they read my own argument, instead of one forged for me by an unprincipled adversary. Yet, be it remembered, that I claimed the victory, not on account of superior talents, but because I advocated God's truth, and because the God of truth condescended to enable a feeble advocate to defend his cause against a powerful assailant. With regard to Mr. Campbell's talents, we are all, in a great measure, agreed. He considers them great, and so do I. Their superiority to mine he has established by several certificates. I do not deny it. Why, then, so much about a matter, on which there is no issue?

We are not so well agreed on every thing said by him and his witnesses. Mr. Vaughan has made a very dashing general accusation, about the affair of Captain Buckner. It is time enough to make a particular answer, when he shall make a particular allegation. Until then, I must be satisfied with pleading *not guilty* to his general charge.(a) In the mean time, let it be remembered that Captain Buckner was a member of my church, and so uniformly and perseveringly attached to me, as a Christian Pastor, that, before my leaving them, he declared that if he were possessed of his former means, he would pay my salary out

(a) This reminds me, that Mr. Campbell mentions certain things, which he says were published against me in Lexington, subsequent to my departure from that place. Their truth he takes for granted, because they have never been contradicted. To this I answer, that I have never got a sight of them. I publicly solicited the writer and his phalanx to come out, like men, while I was on the spot. But they chose, like Mr. Vaughan, to shew their bravery, after the mountains lay between us.

of his own pocket, rather than part with me. Mr. Vaughan admits that this warm friend is "a man of incorruptible integrity." If so, it seems to me, that Mr. Vaughan himself must be somewhat deficient.

In another charge of his, he has not left us to mere presumptive proof. Unhappily for this witness, he does not always deal in vague generalities, but, by venturing a specification, has shewn himself indisputably guilty of the very crime, with which he charges an innocent man. The following are the facts. In my exposure of Mr. Campbell's report, I had written to Mr. Edgar the following words, viz. "You were very well satisfied that I had encountered Mr. Campbell, until your mind was changed a few months afterward, by information received from his neighbourhood. *You then told me*, that, from unanswerable evidence, his character was too low to justify so formal a notice by any respectable man; and that, in defence of my own character, an apology should be made to the public." Compare this with Mr. Vaughan's certificate, and a note which Mr. Campbell has published as Mr. Vaughan's, and which I will here add in brackets, to that part of the text, from which he refers to it by an asterisk. It is as follows, viz. "Edgar did not inform Mr. M'Calla by letter, that you were a man of too low a character for him to have any thing to do with. [This Mr. M'Calla said in his pamphlet.]" According to this pamphlet of mine, Mr. Edgar's communication to me, was a verbal one. made a few months after the debate, and, of course, before I had removed from Kentucky to Philadelphia. The words are, "*You then told me.*" Mr. Vaughan certifies that my pamphlet said that this communication was "BY LETTER." Now it appears, from Mr. Vaughan's own shewing, that Mr. Edgar has never denied that he "*told*" me this, as my pamphlet declares; he only denies that he communicated it *by letter*, a thing which my book does not declare, but which Mr. Vaughan has forged for it. Now where does the real falsehood lie?

Another of Mr. Campbell's witnesses subjects himself to a very easy refutation. "Mr. Moses Ryan, once a zealous Pede-

baptist," as Mr. Campbell states, testifies as follows, viz.
 " I had to experience the mortification of seeing Mr. M'Calla
 " exposed for misquoting the Scriptures to suit his own pur-
 " poses : and in reading extracts from Robinson, with the book
 " in his hand and before his eyes, he would put language in Ro-
 " binson's mouth that was no where to be found in it." " I can
 " unhesitatingly say, that Mr. Campbell has given a fair repre-
 " sentation of all of Mr. M'Calla's arguments, during the four
 " days that I attended, excepting the leaving out of Mr.
 " M'Calla's vulgar, abusive, and ungentlemanly language, to-
 " gether with his base misquotations of the Scriptures and
 " Robinson's History of Baptism."

From this certificate, it appears that I have been guilty of vulgar, abusive, and ungentlemanly language; but Mr. Campbell charitably dropped this from his report, while he faithfully recorded every thing that was decent. It seems that I was guilty of base misquotations of the scriptures, to suit my own purposes ; and of basely interpolating and misquoting Robinson's History of Baptism, while the book was in my hand, and before my eyes: but Mr. Campbell tenderly concealed these errors from the public, while he faithfully reported all my *correct* quotations from the Scriptures, and other books. If there is any meaning in language, this is the meaning of the above testimony.

Let it be remembered that this witness attended only four days, and that two of these four were the sixth and seventh. Then his testimony goes to show that Mr. Campbell, in his report of the sixth and seventh days, omits nothing that I said, except my vulgarities, and my misquotations of the Bible and Robinson. On examining his report, it will be found, that, for each of my half hours on these two days, he has allowed me, upon an average, between one and two pages ; which, according to my way of speaking, would be delivered in less than three minutes. The result then is, that, during the two last days of our debate, I occupied twenty-seven or eight minutes out of every thirty, in gross vulgarities, or base misquotations of the

Bible and Robinson ! This must be true, if Mr. Ryan's testimony be true.

It is a general principle of all law, civil or military, ecclesiastical or social, that particular facts are necessary to support general charges. Notwithstanding Mr. Ryan's testimony, it can be proved, that, during the debate, Mr. Campbell ridiculed my inaccurate quotations of scripture, and in his subsequent report, accused me of making "*material alterations*" of the sacred text. It can also be proved that I called upon him for specifications. He has never, to my knowledge, condescended to produce one instance, in which I interpolated or misquoted Mr. Robinson, whether before my eyes or not ; he has never produced one instance of my misquoting the scriptures, when before my eyes ; nor one inaccurate quotation of them from memory, which would favour my own cause. If my charges against him, had depended upon the general certificates of such men as Mr. Ryan, he would have justly laughed me to scorn. But when I accused him of misquoting the scriptures, or Dr. Owen, or Mr. Walker, or other writers, (and they were not a few,) I submitted to the drudgery of producing Mr. Campbell's words, and comparing them with the original. How gladly would he have done the same, if I had ever given him an opportunity. May God accept my sincere and humble thanks for preserving me from such crimes, and for giving me a cause which needs not such artifices to support it.

The most important object of Mr. Campbell's pamphlet was to shew that his book, which is such a lucrative speculation to him, is really a correct account of our debate. On this subject I would observe, that he has a very unsatisfactory way of proving the correctness of his reports, by the objections of those who impeach them. Mr. Walker published several pages of exceptions to Mr. Campbell's account of their debate; to which he added a dozen pages of exceptions, by one of the Moderators. Mr. Campbell would persuade the public that these "altogether would not make one page ;" and then pretends that if all these exceptions were well substantiated, his Report "would appear from Mr.

“Walker’s own treatise to be a correct representation of the controversy.” My exposure of his Report in our case gave a very great number of particulars. Of these he speaks as follows, viz. “Even when all the particulars he gives are excepted, still the debate as published by me is worthy of the title and credit which it has received.” Now let us examine the title and credit which it has received, and compare these with my exceptions.

The title as published in the printed Prospectus, is “A Debate on Baptism, between Mr. W. L. M’Calla, of Kentucky, and A. Campbell, of Virginia, held in Washington, Mason County, Kentucky, on the 15th of October, 1823, in the presence of many witnesses.” The very next words of the Prospectus promise that “All the arguments on both sides shall be faithfully and impartially DETAILED.” Nothing less than this *detail* would make it the debate which was held between the parties mentioned, at the time and place specified, and in the presence of many witnesses. In the title page of his book, he is still more particular, informing us of the debate which he reports, “commencing on the 15th and terminating on the 21st [22nd] Octob. 1823.” The TITLE of the book, then, authorizes us to expect *a faithful and impartial detail of all the arguments which I delivered in Washington, Kentucky, in a number of speeches, which commenced on the 15th and closed on the 22nd of Octob. 1823, lasting seven days; for the sabbath was left out.* This is a fair account of the *title* of his book.

Now for the “credit which it has received.” Mr. Campbell’s own explanation of this expression is to be found in the certificates of his witnesses, who profess to have heard the debate, as it actually took place, and then to have read and compared his printed report. They testify that so far as they “*heard and read,*” “Mr. Campbell has given in his publication of the debate, both in substance and FORM, fairly and substantially, ALL the arguments offered on both sides of the question.” One calls it “a FULL, fair, and faithful exhibition of all the principal *arguments and topics.*” Another says that it contains “*all the matter and*

argument advanced by both disputants." Another adds, "very generally *the phraseology itself.*" Thus much for the credit of the book. Now add this to the title; and we are authorized by "the title and credit which it has received," to expect that Mr. Campbell's book will furnish *a detailed report, full, faithful, and impartial, in respect of matter, form, and phraseology, of all my topics and arguments, in the seven days debate in Kentucky, October, 1823.*

Mr. Campbell has assured us that this is the real character of the report, even after admitting all the exceptions which I have made. The judgment of candour will consider him as virtually admitting the correctness of my exceptions, in fact, since, serious, numerous, and tangible as they are, he has not overthrown a single one of them; but reposes himself upon their supposed harmlessness. Taking my objections, therefore, for granted, let us compare them with some of the alledged features of his book, and in the undisturbed possession of which he thinks that my exceptions leave it. This must, of course, be done with great brevity.

1. He promises a DETAILED report. My objections, which he has virtually admitted, prove from the book itself, that a great part of it is professedly an ABRIDGED report.

2. He and his witnesses call it a FULL report. My objections shew from his own book, that a great part of it confessedly records short *sums, specimens* and *abstracts*, instead of *full* speeches, while there is not even a specimen recorded of very much that I said.

3. He and his certificates call it a FAITHFUL report. My objections, which he has virtually admitted, shew very numerous misstatements, as to matters of fact; they shew that he has written for me in his dialect, which is, in some instances, foreign to my own, and foreign to correct English; they shew that while using his own language, he has so transposed and altered my sentiments, as to make them error, confusion, and nonsense; they shew that the body of my quotations he has suppressed, while he has partly supplied their place, by greatly and stupidly

enlarging others, and quoting for me, from books which I had never ramed, nor even seen.

4. It is called an IMPARTIAL report. My objections shew that he, though one of the parties, constitutes himself a judge of the weight of argument; and when Mr. Campbell the *Judge*, has decided against the relevancy of arguments opposed to Mr. Campbell the *Party*, he then forbids Mr. Campbell the *Reporter* to record them. This is a very cheap sort of *impartiality*.

5. He and his witnesses alledge that his report has the above qualities in respect of MATTER. My objections prove from his printed book and my manuscript notes, that the *matter* of my speeches is not in his report. His very preface expressly professes to *abbreviate* whole days of my *matter* as my publication shewed at large.

6. They attach the above qualities to his report, with regard to FORM and PHRASEOLOGY. Surely these men must know that there is a difference in the *form* of a SPEECH and a SPECIMEN. They must know that there is a difference in the form of an *oration* occupying thirty minutes, and an *abstract* occupying three minutes. Besides, the very face of the book shews that these *miniatures* are given in his own *phraseology*, and my admitted objections prove that where he pretends to use my language, he actually substitutes his own *phraseology*, even to his idiomatic violations of grammar.

7. Mr. Campbell and his witnesses insist upon the fulness and excellency of his report, in relation to my TOPICS. My manuscript notes and my actual speeches contained *seven topics*: but where will you find these in Mr. Campbell's book? Where, for instance, will you find *the history of the mode of baptism*? My printed objections, which he has virtually admitted, shew, that he, as well as other Baptists, claimed the most respectable Pedobaptists, as advocating their views of the *mode* of baptism; my objections shew, moreover, that these claims were most triumphantly refuted, in my discussion of this *topic*. Perhaps there was not another part of the debate, in which the gross dishonesty of my Opponent, and Danvers, and other Baptist writers, ap-

peared in a more disgraceful light. To bury the remembrance of such an exposure, he has suppressed the whole *topic*, and then persuaded his impartial, disinterested and *neutral* followers, such as Walker Reid, to certify that his report is “*a faithful representation of the TOPICS!*” I would not be the writer of such a declaration, for ten thousand times all the votes, and all the fees, which this *neutral* certificate will procure its author, from the dense Baptist population around him. But let it not be thought that the above is the only instance of dishonesty on this subject. His report allows one page to my fifth *topic*; he allows another page to my sixth and seventh *topics*, which are directly called for by his challenge, and without which, I am deprived of a defence. To the sixth *topic*, which was the most important, he has allowed six lines of that one page. Thus he has entirely suppressed one of my seven *topics*, and half of the remaining six, he has reported in two pages, and that in his own language.

8. Mr. Campbell and his witnesses, alledge, moreover, the excellency and fulness of his report, in relation to my ARGUMENTS. This leads us to evidence from Mr. Campbell’s own pen, that he has laid violent hands upon another *topic*, which has not yet been mentioned. His preface informs us that he has indulged in “*abbreviating*” “*the argument from ecclesiastic history.*” This *argument* occupied the third and fourth *topics*, which related to *the history of the subject of baptism*, and *the history of the mode*. One of these, I have shewn, he has entirely suppressed; and he expressly confesses that he has *abbreviated* the other.

9. Mr. Campbell and his witnesses consider his book as *a report of the Debate* which took place between him and myself, in Washington, Kentucky, on the 15th—to—22nd days of October, 1823. If it be so, it must give my speeches, whether vulgar or polished, relevant or irrelevant, during all the seven days, on all my seven topics, relating to the nature or effects of baptism, and embracing the arguments from scripture and from ecclesiastical history. Instead of this, we find one topic entirely suppress-

ed, three others occupying two pages, and a fifth *abbreviated*, by the *impartial* guillotine of *the opposite party*. Two out of the seven still remain. These I have exposed in a printed volume of objections, not one of which he has refuted, and the validity of which he has virtually admitted, by declining to make any *particular* exception, and by asserting that when my objections are admitted, his report "is worthy of the title and credit which it has received." I have shewn that if these objections be valid, they will prove, that, in reporting me, his work is a mass of misstatements, Campbellisms, transpositions, supplements, interpolations, suppressions, and alterations. The evidence of this is found not only in my notes, but abundantly in his own book, which, of itself, is ground enough for contradicting all his certificates. Even when he and his witness agree in matter of fact, it is amusing to see how they will differ as to the reason of the fact. After all that has been said about the *fulness* of the report, Mr. Campbell, and his witness Mr. Ryan, cannot help conceding that much is omitted; that is, that it is not *full*, unless it can be full, while nine-tenths are wanting. Each of them has his own reason for this great omission. Mr. Campbell attributes it to the irrelevancy of such arguments as that which is drawn from ecclesiastical history. Mr. Ryan will not agree that this argument was suppressed at all, but insists that every thing was reported, "except the leaving out of Mr. M'Calla's vulgar, abusive, and ungentlemanly language, together with his base misquotations of the scriptures and Robinson's History of Baptism;" of which vulgarity and dishonesty, neither he nor any other person can give a single instance!! These cannot be reconciled.

When commencing this review, it was my design to examine Mr. Campbell's *neutral* witnesses, a little more particularly. This may possibly be done at some future period. At present it seems unnecessary. So perfect an imposture cannot long abide the test. The forgery of a Unitarian Baptist cannot always be supported by the mere general *ex parte* certificates

of Unitarians, and the sons and brothers of Baptist preachers, who choose to call themselves NEUTRALS, because they belong to no church; especially while these certificates contradict themselves and one another, and are obviously opposed to the very face of the record about which they testify. God will take care of his own truth and his own people, and on him do I rely, in Jesus' name.



DEFENCE
OF
PEDOBAPTISM.

Friends, Fellow-citizens, and Fellow-Christians,

THE possession of a rational, responsible and immortal nature, should ever make us view religion as of paramount importance. Among innumerable dangers of fatal error, the enjoyment of a full revelation, an infallible rule of faith and practice, is a blessing for which we can never be sufficiently thankful. This blessed volume contains the instruction of the Divine Father, sealed by the blood of the Divine Son, and applied to the heart by the Divine Spirit. Depending upon the grace of the only true God, we should endeavour to give to all his doctrines, precepts, and ordinances, that inherent and relative weight which they claim in the inspired volume. Our views of the Christian sacraments, as to their nature, relations, and consequences, are thought defective and erroneous, by some who are eminent for piety and intelligence. Yet while they condemn us, they accuse each other also. Mr. Booth, an advocate for strict communion, says concerning his Baptist brethren “who plead for free communion,” that they “treat “the ordinance [of baptism] as if it were a mere circumstance in divine worship; an indifferent thing; and dispense with it just as occasion requires.” “The Lord’s

“supper, however, is considered and treated by them in
 “a different manner; for they speak of it as a delightful,
 “an edifying, an important institution. But what
 “authority have they for thus distinguishing between
 “two appointments of the same Lord, intended for the
 “same persons, of equal continuance in the Christian
 “church, and alike required of proper subjects?
 “They have indeed the example of some Socinians, and
 “the venerable sanction of the whole Council of Trent:
 “for the title of one chapter in the records of that coun-
 “cil, is, ‘Concerning the excellence of the most holy
 “Eucharist, above the rest of the sacraments.’”(a) Con-
 cerning this preference of one sacrament to another,
 Mr. Booth asks, “Can such a conduct be pious, humble,
 or rational?” Yet impious, proud, and irrational as this
 conduct may be, it is feared that my Opponent has been
 guilty of it. It is true that he does not, like the free-
 communion Baptists, prefer the eucharist to baptism,
 but he does what is equally condemnable in Mr. Booth’s
 esteem, he gives baptism a decided preeminence over
 the eucharist, if not over faith and obedience. “Baptism,”
 says he “is an ordinance of the greatest importance and of
 “momentous significance. Never was there an ordinance
 “of so great import or design.” “He [Christ] does not
 “say, he that believeth and keeps my commands shall
 “be saved: but he saith ‘he that believeth and is bap-
 “tized shall be saved.’ He placeth baptism on the right
 “hand of faith.” “To every believer therefore, bap-
 “tism is a formal and personal remission, or purgation

(a) Booth’s Apology, pp. 177, 178. London Edition of 1812.

“ of sins. The believer never has his sins formally washed away or remitted until he is baptized. The water has no efficacy but what God’s appointment gives it, and he has made it sufficient for this purpose.”(b) He “ said that baptism is inseparably connected with a formal pardon of sin; and spoke very boastingly of having never, for an hour, felt guilt of conscience, since his baptism.”(c) Those who hold such a religion as this, will always harbour animosity against pious Pedobaptists, as naturally as the Western Indians opposed the venerable Zeisberger, the Moravian Missionary, “ in consequence chiefly of the insinuations of some Pagan teachers, who had strenuously recommended the use of emetics, as a speedy and infallible method of cleansing from sin.”(d) No doubt, there was many a deluded mortal among them, who “ spoke very boastingly of having never, for an hour, felt guilt of conscience, since his” vomiting. How different is this Pagan stuff from the scriptural account of Baptism! Paul says “ Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.”(e) If he had viewed it as my Opponent does, he would have considered the work of baptizing to be the most important object of his mission. But he here uses a negative as the strongest contrast, to show its great inferiority to the essentials of Christianity.

When I speak of the relative diminutiveness of the tangible sacraments, I would not be understood as insinu-

(b) Campbell’s Spurious Debate in Kentucky, pp. 117. 135.

(c) Lowry’s Notes, given to me.

(d) Brown’s History of Missions, Vol. 1.p. 435. Philadelphia Edition of 1816,

(e) 1 Cor. i. 17.

ating that they are unimportant. Far be it from me to despise such valuable privileges! May my soul ever rejoice in that heavenly condescension which has bestowed them! Our Fathers did well in reproving the *Man of sin* for robbing the laity of the eucharistic cup; and they did as well in reproving certain Pseudo-reformers for robbing infants of the baptismal seal. Since the Pedobaptist world is arraigned before the public, under the heaviest charges, and since I am providentially called to confront our bold Accuser, the task is undertaken, with a trembling cheerfulness, and in humble reliance upon the Spirit of Christ, without whose help I can do nothing.

The contested proposition, for the discussion of which we have met on this occasion, is contained in a general printed challenge, first uttered by my Opponent, several years ago, at the close of a debate which he had with a Pedobaptist Minister in another state, and afterward printed for general circulation, in his professed report of that debate, which I have in my hand. In that challenge he undertakes to prove that "Infant-sprinkling is a human tradition, and injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political." As I plead, *not guilty*, we join issue upon the very words of the accusation which you have just heard.

To the language of the proposition I at first objected, in part, because the term *infant-sprinkling* was intended as a sneer. If we were to call them *Dippers*, and call their baptism *Ducking*, they would probably think that a sneer was intended: yet they would not have more reason for such a suspicion, than we have

in the present case. They call themselves Baptists, and not *Divers, Plungers, or Dippers*. As convenience requires that they should have a name, we allow them the one which they assume ; but we do it from courtesy, and not because we believe that they are *Baptizers* more than ourselves. If the peculiarities of their system were necessary to make a man a *Baptizer*, (which is the original meaning of the word Baptist,) then the precursor of our Lord should not be called John the *Baptist*, or John the *Baptizer*, since there is satisfactory evidence that he baptized infants, and that by sprinkling or pouring. But as the Author of the accusation now under discussion was not willing to remove or change the offensive expression, *infant-sprinkling*, all that we wish is, to have its meaning clearly settled. This is done effectually by the context, in which he says, “ It is my time to give an invitation or challenge to “ any *Pedo-baptist* minister ;” and again, “ I feel disposed to meet any *Pedo-baptist* minister, of any denomination,” &c. As the challenge, therefore, is directed to *Pedo-baptists*, it is evident that *Pedo-baptism* is to be the subject of discussion, and that this is what is meant by *infant-sprinkling*. The position, then, which he has engaged to maintain is, that *infant-baptism*, as practised by us, in the mode of sprinkling, pouring, or washing, is a factitious and pernicious institution. In his publications he has endeavoured to establish this general charge, by many particulars of a very odious character. If they be correct, we must be the enemies of God and man : if they be incorrect, he must a false Accuser and a bitter Adversary of

Christ and his Church. If he has published more than he then meant, or more than he is willing now to prosecute, he is present to declare it. If no such declaration is made, you will, of course, demand good evidence in support of such formidable charges.

Against such allegations, by whomsoever brought, I willingly stand on the defensive: against such affirmations, by whomsoever made, I willingly espouse the negative. In so doing, I would endeavour, conscientiously and scripturally, to defend a command of God, and not those adventitious errors which Papists or Protestants have engrafted on it. If will-worship, self-righteousness and superstition, schism and heresy, anarchy, oppression, and persecution are ever found connected with our system, I can only reply that this is an unnatural connexion, since these evils are from hell, and infant-baptism is from heaven. If my Opponent mean to prove that the use of the cross, and of oil and wine, and milk and honey in baptism, is a human tradition, I have no objection: but while this is made out undeniably, it will also appear that *infant-baptism* belongs to what he calls “the traditions of the Apostles,” and that this Apostolical *tradition* or *injunction* is no more answerable for its illegitimate connexions, than the scriptures are answerable for destroying souls, when, through human depravity, they become a savour of death unto death; or than adult-baptism is answerable for the innumerable evils with which it is accompanied. And let it be remembered that this is practised by all Pedobaptists; for our system is to baptize believers and their seed. Christian baptism, thus administered, has sometimes

been accompanied with much evil, as is the bible in which it is commanded; and infidels charge all this evil upon God's word and ordinances; whether righteously or not, judge ye.

Whether *infant-baptism* be right or wrong, useful or hurtful, may be decided without any other evidence than the simple word of God. This proof is the best, because it is certain and infallible. That evidence which is derived from uninspired writings, whether doctrinal or historical, though strong, is nevertheless inferior. It would save much time and strength to omit it altogether. I mention this because my Opponent has already asserted, more than once, that the true church, from the Apostles' days to the present time, were Baptists. Although the challenge will certainly allow him this latitude, he would do me a favour by confining himself to the scriptures, at least in relation to the subject and mode of baptism. Its injurious effects he may prove in any way that he pleases: Let him produce scripture only, to show that infant-baptism is forbidden, and that immersion only is baptism, and then he shall have proved that "*infant-sprinkling* is a human tradition." But reasonable as this wish is, he intimates that it cannot be gratified. In addition, then, to infallible scriptural evidence in favour of our *subject* and *mode* of baptism, I shall be required to producè what might be called uninspired presumptive or probable evidence to the same points. I shall have to show that the Christian Church has always baptized infants, and that it has never considered submersion essential to this ordinance. This will have to be followed by evidence that the Bap-

tists of England and America, instead of being born in the first century (as my Opponent has repeatedly asserted,) had their origin in the sixteenth. The topics of discussion, then, which my Opponent has cut out for me, are the following; viz.

1. The scriptural subject of baptism.
2. The scriptural mode.
3. The history of the subject.
4. The history of the mode.
5. The history of Anabaptism.
6. The effects of the subject.
7. The effects of the mode.

In discussing these topics, while I would avoid shrinking from the duty of defending the truth, I would respect the feelings of pious Baptists, and avoid unnecessary recriminations against those mistaken Christians of that denomination, who, uncharitably, unrighteously, and untruly, make common cause with our Accuser, in slandering their brethren for obeying a divine command. To the true church, God has said, “No weapon that is
“formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue
“that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt con-
“demn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord,
“and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord.” This we believe. In the exercise of a conscience void of offence towards God and man, we are willing to take shelter under this promise, for protection against the accusations of our present Adversary, and of all those who support him.

When a man brings such serious charges as those

which are now under consideration, he should have some plan of attack. In opening the cause, which my Accuser has professed to do, he should, as far as time allowed, give us some general view of the law and the testimony; something to which a reply may be made. But, in what he calls the opening of the debate, he has not laid before you as much as can be felt between the thumb and finger. His whole speech was occupied in a laboured effort to make his audience benevolent, attentive, and docile, according to Cicero's instructions. As I did not come here to set myself off by rhetorical arts, but to recommend religion, by defending its sacred institutions, and its pious professors, I have been compelled, though in the negative, virtually to open the cause myself. I shall therefore proceed immediately to the discussion of those topics which my Opponent's challenge and present determination force upon our attention, and which have been already enumerated in my division.

TOPIC I.

THE SCRIPTURAL SUBJECT OF BAPTISM.

On this subject, my opinion is accurately expressed in the following words :

The Scriptures consider infants as suitable, though not exclusive subjects of Christian Baptism.

The challenge asserts that " Infant-sprinkling is a human tradition." My reply is, that the Scriptures con-

D

sider infants as suitable, though not exclusive subjects of Christian baptism. Instead of this proposition, some would state that Pedobaptism is a divine institution. To avoid repeated and unnecessary distinctions and circumlocutions, I often use this declaration myself. But as a proposition for discussion, it is thought to be deficient in accuracy. We believe that adult baptism is a divine institution, and that female baptism is a divine institution, as well as male baptism: and so we might appear to multiply institutions according to the ages, sexes, colours, and conditions of mankind. Each of these has the appearance of excluding the rest. Of this appearance, Baptist controversialists take an unfair advantage. When we advocate infant-baptism as a divine institution, they try to make the world believe that we thereby reject adult baptism, whereas we hold and practice both: when the Bible teaches adult baptism, they conclude that it rejects infant baptism, whereas the Bible teaches, and the Apostles practised both. To shut the door against such quibbles, my proposition formally admits that infants are not the exclusive subjects of Christian baptism, while it asserts that they are suitable subjects of this divine institution, according to the testimony of God's word.

But now that we are approaching the lively oracles, my Opponent begins to dread an appeal to this irrefragable testimony. He insists upon my passing this over, and engaging in *a priori* reasonings, which he knows would be much more inefficient in our defence than inspired authority. For me to quote scripture, he insinuates, would be only a fatiguing loss of breath and

waste of time. His words are these, viz : “ Before we “ spend our breath, waste our time, or fatigue our bodies “ in this discussion, let us know, *cui bono*, for what “ good, or what benefit to infants we contend.” “ We “ know of no benefit,” says he, “ that could be conferred “ on them by sprinkling a few drops of water upon “ their faces.”(f) Perhaps my Opponent knows that these questions are often asked concerning his baptism as well as ours, and with as much force. And Booth complains that some eminent Baptists themselves seem to doubt the utility of adult immersion, and thereby to approach that sect which denies the utility and obligation of either baptism or the Lord’s supper.(g) It is true that my Opponent professes to have discovered great utility in adult immersion; it purges from sin. In this he excels the Hemerobaptists, who cleanse themselves from all sin by a daily immersion. But Bishop Hobart is up with him even here; for he believes that infant baptism is regeneration; and both are about as wise as those Western Indians who believed that their sins were purged by emetics.

In demanding evidence of utility in the threshold of this discussion, my Accuser opposes Jews and Christians, inspired and uninspired, heretical and orthodox, Baptist and Pedobaptist. Matt. v. 19. shews that the least of God’s commandments is binding, whether we think it useful or not. In admirable consistency with this, Booth quotes from Stapfer the following sentiments of Orobius, a learned Jew, viz. “ The ritual law de-

(f) Debate, p. 46.

(g) Booth’s Apology, p. 181.

“ pends upon the will of the Legislator only ; sometimes,
 “ or generally, no foundation for it being discovered in
 “ natural reason. But it does not obtain on that account
 “ an inferior degree of perfection, (supposing the wis-
 “ dom and goodness of the Legislator to be infinite,)
 “ but ought rather to be esteemed of a higher and
 “ sublimer order : it being indeed supposed that an infi-
 “ nitely good and wise God can never prescribe to man
 “ laws which are vain and unsuitable. In proportion as the
 “ reason of them is more hidden to us, so should we the
 “ more believe that it belongs to the secret of divine
 “ wisdom : so that we should not either curiously or
 “ philosophically scrutinize, but be in obedient subjec-
 “ tion to his command, by which we may shew our
 “ love, and a becoming reverence to the Supreme Crea-
 “ tor : believing, with the whole heart, all things which
 “ his wisdom, infinitely worthy, exceedingly good, and
 “ most perfect, proposes to be observed by us, whether
 “ [or not] that wisdom can or will dispense or intermit
 “ for some occasion. And it belongs to a more signal
 “ obedience to observe those things, than such com-
 “ mandments of God as we discover to be founded in
 “ our reason : for such as these, even if God had not
 “ enjoined, men may know and observe, as many of
 “ the Gentiles have done, without any view to the
 “ authority of God.”——But merely from their opinion
 of their *cui bono*.

On this subject, even Dr. Priestly is more correct
 than my Opponent. As quoted by Booth, he declares
 that “ Every divine command ought certainly to be
 “ implicitly complied with, even though we should not

“ be able to discern the reason of it.”——That is, the *cui bono* of it. “ In things of external appointment,” (says Dr. Samuel Clarke, quoted by Booth,) “ and “ mere positive institution, where we cannot, as in “ matters of natural and moral duty, argue concerning “ the natural reason and ground of the obligation, and “ the original necessity of the thing itself; we have “ nothing to do but to obey the positive command. God “ is infinitely better able than we to judge of the propriety and usefulness [the *cui boni*] of the things, he “ institutes; and it becomes us to obey with humility “ and reverence.” The same author quotes Bishop Hall as saying, “ It hath been ever God’s wont, by “ small precepts to prove men’s dispositions. Obedience “ is as well tried in a trifle as in the most important “ charge: yea, so much more, as the thing required “ is less: for oftentimes those who would be careful “ in main affairs, think they may neglect the smallest. “ What command so ever we receive from God, or our “ superiors, we must not scan the weight, [the *cui bono*] “ of the thing, but the authority of the commander.” The same Baptist writer quotes Witsius as saying that, “ One who resolves to obey God in some things only, “ but excepts others, which he does [or not] according “ to his own judgment [of their *cui bono*,] he does not “ serve God, but pleases himself. The true ground of “ obedience is the authority of him who commands; “ which, as it is the same in all precepts, all then, it is “ concluded, must be of equal obligation.”

These are all Baptist authorities, because adopted

by Booth(h) in support of his sentiments, which he expresses in his own words as follows, viz. “As in the
 “great concerns of religious worship, nothing should
 “be done that is not required by Jehovah; and as the
 “lawfulness of all positive rites depends entirely on
 “their divine Author and his institution; so he who
 “complies with some, and neglects others that are
 “equally commanded and equally known, may please
 “himself, but he does not obey the Lord.” “For it is
 “not the manifest excellence, or the great utility
 “[the *cui bono*] of any divine appointment, that is the
 “true reason of our submission to it; but the authority
 “of him that commands.”

You have already perhaps observed that my Opponent himself advocates this same doctrine at some times, though he contradicts it at other times. He has quoted a passage from Bishop Hoadly, in which he says, “All
 “positive duties depend [not upon the question of
 “*cui bono*, but] entirely upon the will and declaration
 “of the person who institutes or ordains them, with
 “respect to the real design and end of them, and consequently to the due manner of performing them.” To the same purpose he has quoted largely from Bishop Taylor, who says that “The will of the law-giver,
 “[and not the question of *cui bono*] is all the reason
 “for obedience.”(i) But in the debate with Mr. Walker we have my Opponent’s own words to this effect as follows; viz. “Having now distinguished

(h) They may be found in the following pages of his Apology. 71. 100. 179. 180.

(i) Debate pp. 69. 70.

“ positive and moral institutions, I proceed to shew that
 “ on no account whatsoever in positive requirements,
 “ are we to attempt to reason upon the expediency
 “ [the *cui bono*] of the things enjoined, but implicitly
 “ to obey on all occasions. When Eve, the mother of
 “ us all, began to reason on the expediency [the *cui*
 “ *bono*] of eating the forbidden fruit, she began to sin.
 “ She reasoned that as the fruit of that tree was pleasant
 “ to the sight, and to be desired to make one wise,
 “ there could be no harm in eating of it; consequently
 “ she concluded to taste it. Of the incorrectness of
 “ her [*cui bono*] reasoning, and of her incapacity, even
 “ when in Eden, to draw a correct inference, when
 “ reasoning on a positive institution, we have, alas!
 “ a melancholy proof”————as we have in her
 “ *cui bono* descendant in this debate.(k)

Often as my Opponent contradicts himself, he hardly
 ever does it without what he considers good policy. He
 published a challenge, to shew his courage; and after-
 ward denied it, to throw the odium upon his Op-
 ponent. Why did he say so much in his letters, about
 his holding the *negative* of our question? Because it
 afforded what he thought a plausible pretext for demand-
 ing the closing speech. Why does he now urge as
 strongly that he holds the *affirmative* of the very same
 question? The Moderators, to whom he has appealed,
 can answer, that this is made a pretext for demanding,
 that, as he has professedly opened the debate, I should
 not be permitted to choose my own plan of defence, but

(k) Debate with Mr. W. p. 46. On the same page in his 2nd debate
 we find his *cui bono* contradiction.

be compelled to leave the solid evidence upon which my cause rests, and follow the *ignis fatuus* of his declamation. Again; why is it that he insists so strongly upon the good old doctrine, that we must unreservedly obey every command of God, without waiting to discuss its expediency, or its *cui bono*? Because he hopes to pervert this truth to the sophistical conclusion that “nothing short of [what he means by] an *express* divine command can authorize” infant baptism: as if an *implicit* command were not binding at all! But when I approach the subject too closely, and seem in danger of producing a divine command, he complains that by such a course we should only “spend our breath, waste our time, and fatigue our bodies.” Why does he then insist, in opposition to his former principles, concerning positive institutions, that we must first examine the question of expediency, “*CUI BONO, for what good, or [for] what benefit* to infants” is this institution intended? These questions you can answer.

I wish you to keep in mind the proposition with which I have set out, on the scriptural subject of baptism. It is, that “the scriptures consider infants as suitable, though not exclusive subjects of Christian baptism.” Baptist polemics generally take it for granted that this is impossible in the nature of things; and think that infant baptism necessarily rejects adult baptism, and that adult baptism necessarily excludes the other, as if these were two distinct and irreconcilable baptisms. Booth says, “If infant sprinkling be a human invention, disown it but if it be from heaven, embrace it and lay the other absolutely aside, as des-

“ titute of a divine warrant ; for as there is but *one God*
 “ and *one faith*, so there is but *one baptism*.”^(l) This
 writer is much in the habit of illustrating the sacra-
 ments of baptism and the eucharist by a reference to
 circumcision and the Passover.^(m) We all know that
 there was only one circumcision as well as one baptism.
 How then would it look to reason on the former, as he
 has done on the latter? If infant circumcision be a
 human tradition, disown it——but if it be from
 heaven, embrace it——and lay adult circumcision
 absolutely aside——for as there is but *one God*
 and *one faith*, so there is but *one circumcision!!!* Yes,
 there was but *one* circumcision ; yet it was administered
 to adults and infants : so there is but *one* baptism, which,
 like circumcision, is the seal of the righteousness of *one*
 faith ; yet this also is scripturally administered to believ-
 ers and their seed.

Scriptural statements of the qualifications of adult
 subjects are always quoted on this point “He that be-
 “ lieveth and is baptized shall be saved : but he that
 “ believeth not shall be damned.” “Go ye therefore
 “ and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of
 “ the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;
 “ *teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I
 “ have commanded you : and lo, I am with you always,
 “ even unto the end of the world.”⁽ⁿ⁾ We are both
 agreed that these passages exclude from baptism,
 those *adults* who are destitute of knowledge, because
 they must first be *taught*——of faith, because they

(l) Close of his Apology. (m) See his Apology. pp. 145. 149.

(n) Mark xvi. 16. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

are required to *believe*—and of obedience, because they are required to *observe all things*. We are both agreed on another point also, which is as plainly taught by these texts as the one just now stated. That is, that those intelligent adults who are destitute of knowledge, faith and obedience, are deprived of Christ's gracious presence, by his Spirit, *unto the end of the world*, and of his *salvation* in eternity. We agree, in a third position, that the privilege of baptism, the enjoyment of Christ's Spirit, and eternal salvation are here secured to believing adults. There is a fourth point in which we can possibly meet. The Apostle Peter shews that the promise of the Spirit of sanctification and salvation is to believers and their children; "The promise is unto you and to your children." The fifth point is the one on which we differ. Do these passages exclude infants from baptism? They affirm; we deny. They say that Christ's command to *teach* and *baptize* all nations, excludes infants as incapable of instruction: then are they not excluded from his promise, "lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world?" They say that our Saviour's declaration, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," excludes infants as incapable of faith: but the next clause says, "he that believeth not shall be damned." If, then the former clause deprives them of baptism, because incapable of faith, this latter one excludes from salvation all infants who cannot believe. Mr. Robinson's "good Baptist," Michael Servetus, of the sixteenth century, saw the necessity of this conclusion, and admitted its correctness. He rejected infants from baptism and from salvation

together, because they could not believe; and supported his doctrine by that text which says, “He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.”(o) This mode of interpretation, if consistently maintained, would exclude infants from daily bread, as well as from baptismal water Paul says, “This we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat.”(p) Our Opponents should say, *infants cannot work, therefore infants should not eat.* Why do they not reason and act thus? Because they know that this command related to adults who ought to work, and will not; and not to infants who cannot work. Just so Pedobaptists interpret the above texts concerning baptism. They are intended to exclude adults who ought to believe, but will not: and not infants which are neither believers nor unbelievers. And to reason otherwise, is as absurd as to say that the sheep on the right hand of Christ, at the day of judgment, are intended to exclude not only the goats, but the lambs also.

Such sentiments as the above texts contain, are found in Pedobaptist writers, and Pedobaptist creeds, in every age and country: and, what is remarkable, Baptist writers quote them, as they do the scriptures, in opposition to that system which their authors maintain. They cannot help confessing that after Cyprian’s day, Pedobaptism prevailed in the church; and yet when Cyprian and other Fathers talk of the necessity of believing and repenting before baptism, they quote these expressions against infant baptism, although they know

(o) Calvin’s Institutes. Book 4. ch. xvi. sect. 31.

(p) 2 Thess. iii. 10. in Calv. Inst. B. 4. ch. xvi. s. 29.

that their authors were Pedobaptists, and never meant them to apply to infants. Speaking of baptism, Cyprian declares that all “will perish,” “unless they do “come with *repentance* to that only salutary sacrament “of the church.” On the same subject Gregory Nyssen says, “Prayer to God, and the imploring of the heavenly “grace, and the water, and *faith*, are the things that “make up the sacrament of regeneration.” To the same amount, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Augustine. Basil says, “One must believe first, and then be “sealed with baptism.” ‘Jerom says of the Apostles, ‘that they first taught the nations, and then baptized ‘them; “for it cannot be that the body do receive “the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul have before “received the true faith.” ’(q) If the scriptures forbid infant baptism, so do these Fathers: but both sides know that these Fathers held infant baptism and required faith as a qualification in adults only; and so we believe the scriptures do.

But the inconsistency of our Opponents does not stop with the scriptures and the Fathers. They have claimed the Pedobaptist Reformers and reformed churches and their successors to the present day. They even quote against Infant baptism, the standards of the Pedobaptist churches with which we are conversant and connected; and most certainly, they are as much against it as the scriptures are. Both alike require faith in the subject. The Catechism of the Church of England says, “There is required of persons to be baptized, faith-

(q) Wall's Defence. pp. 346. 347.

“and repentance.” Our Catechism says that in a sacrament, “Christ and the benefits of the new covenant” are represented, sealed and applied to believers.” The same work says that their efficacy depends upon “the blessing of Christ, and the working of his Spirit” in them that by faith receive them.”^(r) In the close of my Opponent’s book against Mr. Walker, these and similar passages of our Creed are explained just as the scriptures are, in opposition to infant baptism. On the first of them the writer says, “Mark, only to believers. Are infants capable of believing?” On the second passage he says, “Here mark again, “the blessing of Christ and the working of his Spirit” is wholly restricted to them that by faith receive them. Is it possible to suppose that infants can so receive? Then surely it would be wrong not to admit them also to the Lord’s table. But the thing being insupposable, they are therefore equally debarred from both.” On the whole, he observes, “Are not all the blessings and benefits specified in them exclusively confined to believers? Obviously so, as the words unequivocally declare, in express concurrence with the scriptures cited for proof, at the bottom of the page, under the respective answers. According to the manifest scope and tenor of all those documents taken together, what comes of infant-sprinkling? It stands excluded to all intents and purposes. No room is left for it, if the forecited documents contain words of truth.”^(s)

(r) Larger Cat. Questions, 93, 91. (s) 2nd Edition, p. 290, 291.

Thus does this writer profess to prove that, by our Catechism, infants are “equally debarred from” baptism and the Lord’s supper; and that from our own creed, Pedobaptism “stands excluded to all intents and purposes.” It is no wonder, then, that he says this of the scriptures. But on this subject I can tell him what probably never before entered his mind. It is this; that, according to his rules of interpretation, it can be shewn that our Catechism, as well as the scriptures, exclude infants from salvation as well as from baptism, by requiring faith for the one as well as the other. It speaks as follows; viz. “To escape the wrath and curse of “ God due to us for sin, God requireth of us faith in “ Jesus Christ, repentance unto life, with the diligent “ use of all the outward means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption.”(*t*) On this article my Opponent might speak as follows; *Mark!!!* Only to believers, to penitents, to diligent seekers. Can children believe? can children repent? can children diligently use the means of grace? Is not salvation here “ exclusively confined to believers? Obviously so, as the “ words unequivocally declare, in express concurrence “ with the scriptures cited for proof, at the bottom of “ the page.” “ According to the manifest scope and “ tenor” of the article, “ what comes of infant” salvation? “ It stands excluded to all intents and purposes.” To all such reasoning, whether on the scriptures or the catechism, whether on infant salvation or infant

(*t*) Shorter Cat. Quest. 85. See Larger Cat. Qu. 153.

baptism, I can make no better answer than Goldsmith has furnished me with: and that is, *Fudge*.

But the work from which I have quoted, professes to admit that our standards advocate Pedobaptism, and therefore accuses them of the inconsistency of approving it in one place, and condemning it in another. The same, however, might as correctly be said of their declarations on infant salvation. According to Baptist rules of interpretation the above passage excludes them all from heaven, for the want of faith: but another passage says, “Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth.”^(u) They must believe these to be contradictions. Before our ecclesiastical constitution is condemned for inconsistency among the many alledged faults of that transcendant production, let us try it by such sober rules as practical wisdom has established for the interpretation of our civil laws. Blackstone says, “One part of a statute must be so construed by another, that the whole may, (if possible) stand: *ut res magis valeat, quam pereat*.” According to this rule we can admit that the church is sincere in professing to believe that elect infants dying in infancy, are saved without faith; and, in perfect consistency with this, they believe that faith, repentance, and the diligent use of the means of grace, are necessary to the salvation of adults. In this way we reconcile the declarations of our Saviour and one of his Apostles. Peter says, concerning the

(u) Conf. of Faith. ch. x. sect. 3.

promise of salvation by the blood and Spirit of Christ, “The promise is unto you and to your children.” Doubtless many of these children who died in infancy, were saved without faith. Yet our Saviour says, “he that believeth not shall be damned.” This, then, must be understood of adults: *ut res magis valeat quam pereat*. So when our church or other churches, or when Christian Fathers and Reformers, and ministers approve of baptizing infants without faith, they are sincere: and they are no less so, when they affirm that faith is necessary to baptism; because they mean this of adults; so that it is quite *possible* “that the whole may stand.” Thus we explain the scriptures. When they speak of the ecclesiastical or ceremonial holiness of children, and of circumcising and baptizing whole households on the faith of the parent, when the infants cannot believe, we receive it as true: and it is no less true that they often require personal piety as a qualification for baptism; because they often speak of adult subjects. This interpretation is of such a character, *that the whole may stand* without contradiction; *that the thing may have some meaning, rather than perish*, by inconsistency.

But my Opponent may tell me, ‘this is the point to be tried. Prove that the scriptures do consider *‘infants* as suitable subjects of Christian baptism, and *‘we* can easily prove that *adults*, are proper subjects; *‘and* we may possibly admit that the two may go together without inconsistency.’ To prove that the *scriptures* do admit infants to this ordinance, is the very thing which I hope soon to do: but before coming to this

point, it is necessary to declare what is meant by the *scriptures*, and what weight is to be given to them in this controversy. With the Westminster Assembly, I can truly say that “Under the name of holy scripture, “or the word of God written, are now contained all “the books of the Old and New Testament,” “all “which are given by inspiration of God, to be the “rule of faith and life.”(v) With them, I can conscientiously quote from the Old and New Testaments to prove that “the infants of one or both believing “parents are to be baptized.” Yet would you believe that these very words, for the proof of which they have referred to Genesis and Galatians, are in that same Chapter on Baptism, which my Opponent quotes as denying the authority of the Old Testament in this controversy; merely because it is there stated that “Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ.”(w) This my Opponent takes as his text, and professes to build upon it as follows, viz: “1. We shall go to the New Testament, and not to “the Old, to ascertain the nature, design, and subject “of this ordinance. 2. We shall appeal to the words of “Jesus Christ, for the institution of baptism, as our text “says, it is an ordinance of Jesus Christ; we shall have “nothing to do with Moses in this matter, however “useful he may be in others. No doubt our Opponent “will feel his creed honored, and will acquiesce in “our method as correct.” “In establishing the first “point, that a believer is the only subject of baptism,

(v) Chap. i. sect. 2.

(w) Ch. xxviii. sect. 1. 4.

“ I will, according to my text, appeal exclusively to
 “ the New Testament; and reason itself will justify
 “ me in this particular; for who would go to the Old
 “ Testament to find an ordinance which is not in it,
 “ and which belongs exclusively to the *New?*”(x).

Whether this ordinance belongs *exclusively* to the New Testament, is a point which we are about to try. We are about to see whether the words immediately preceding those which my Opponent has quoted are not also true. They are as follows, viz. “The sacraments
 “ of the Old Testament, in regard of the spiritual things
 “ thereby signified and exhibited, were, for substance the
 “ same with those of the New.” I agree with the authors of my Opponents *text*, that this initiatory rite, is, in its present form, an ordinance of the New Testament; but I agree with them in believing moreover, that in its substance, it is found in the Old Testament: and because it is there undeniably administered to infants, therefore the opposers of infant baptism are too apt to reject the authority of the Old Testament. Consider well the following words of my Opponent, in the prospectus of one of his publications. “The Editor acknow-
 “ ledging no standard of religious faith or works, other
 “ than the Old and New Testaments, and the latter as
 “ the only standard of the religion of Jesus Christ, will,
 “ intentionally at least, oppose nothing which it contains,
 “ and recommend nothing which it does not enjoin.” As it is the new Testament only, which he will not intentionally oppose, we are left to infer that he will

(x) See Campbell's Spurious Debate, pp. 57, 58.

intentionally oppose the Old Testament, as he most assuredly does. But this he thinks justifiable, since it is not the standard, in whole nor in part, of the Christian religion, but of some other religion ; what this other religion is, he may yet tell us.

In rejecting the authority of the Old Testament, my Opponent only follows his instructor, the celebrated disciple of Dr. Priestley. Robinson quotes with approbation, the error of the Massalians, who “thought the Old Testament a true history, but not a rule of Christian action.” The same thing he observes concerning the Manicheans ; and then asks, “Who doth not see the justness of this sentiment?” He then observes that “the Fathers, particularly the Africans derived all the errors that founded and supported their hierarchy [that is, they derived Pedobaptism] from the Old Testament.” These observations belong to nine *quarto* pages, which the American Editor has left out in one place ; because, in them, Robinson comes out as the advocate of Manicheism, Socinianism, and every filthy thing which he can lay his hands on. (y) If he be really sincere, in saying that the African Fathers derived all their errors, as he calls them, from the Old Testament, then he must consider the Old Testament the worst book that was ever written, not even the Westminster Confession excepted : for he evidently considers the African Fathers the worst men, and their system the worst religion, that can be found on earth, or (I might say) in hell ; but this great Baptist champion did not believe that there was a hell.

After rejecting one half of God's word, Robinson and his Socinians came very naturally to despise the other half, and to throw contempt upon the external means of grace in general. Pious Baptists of the present day are not, perhaps, aware that this has been very much the character of their sect from the beginning. This arose in some measure, from their opposition to original sin, and having too good an opinion of themselves. Stapfer says, concerning them, "Because they who had attained
 " the highest grade of perfection and sanctity, no longer
 " needed the external means of grace; hence they set
 " no great value upon the use of the sacred scriptures,
 " and they deny that the reading of the Old Testament
 " especially is useful to men of their society, either
 " that the doctrine of truth may be known, or the study
 " of piety promoted." (z)

Such sentiments as these, whether in Baptists or Pedobaptists, are essentially wrong. An inspired Apostle of the New Testament says concerning the scriptures of the Old Testament, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for
 " reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness." (a) If we were discussing the question of infidelity instead of Christian baptism, I would, of course, endeavour to prove the divine authority of the Scriptures. At present we shall have to take this for granted. Whatever can be proved from the inspired volume, I shall consider as well proved; and none but an infidel will say otherwise. Indeed the latitude which

(z) Institutions of Polemic Theology, ch. xviii, sect. 10.

(a) 2 Tim. iii, 16.

I take is embraced in that very rule which my Opponent has quoted with so much applause, concerning the interpretation of one part of scripture by another. It is also contemplated in another passage quoted from the same excellent work, which declares the scriptures, in regard to all essentials, sufficiently plain even to the unlearned, “in a due use of the ordinary means.”(b) It is to the unlearned, chiefly, that the argument of an unlearned man is now addressed. To their satisfaction I hope to shew, that the scriptures consider infants as suitable, though not exclusive subjects of Christian baptism. This proposition is based upon divine command and Apostolical practice.

ARGUMENT I.

DIVINE COMMAND.

On the authority of God, in relation to baptism, Booth quotes a very precious sentiment of the great Cartwright, the Father of the Puritans. “As the salvation of men
“ought to be dear unto us; so the glory of God, which
“consisteth in that his orders be kept, ought to be much
“more dear.” A holy zeal for observing and enforcing all God’s commandments, out of regard to their Author, is a lovely Christian grace: but as my Opponent has just now observed that “all things in scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all,”(c) our zeal must be accompanied with knowledge, or it

(b) See our Confession of Faith, ch. i. sect. 7. 9. quoted in the Spurious Report, pp. 56. 57.

(c) Spurious Report, p. 56.

will degenerate into bigotry, or be converted into rebellion. My Opponent seems to think that nothing but what he calls an *express* command can authorize the baptism of infants; as if God had no right to claim obedience to any law which was not framed according to my Opponent's directions. Even if the scriptures were to use the very words, *baptize infants*, or *baptize children*, it would not answer the purpose; because, according to the criticisms with which his Master, Robinson, has furnished him, *infants* and *children*, and all such words, signify *men* and not *babes*. As such an *express* command would be unavailing, we do not think it disparaging to the solid evidence which the scriptures contain, to say, that this evidence does not satisfy his demands. In my opinion, that person shews a divine command for our system, who proves that God once gave to the church a command, yet unrepealed, to administer to infants that initiatory seal of which baptism is the New Testament form;——who proves that this is included in the command to *disciple* all nations, *baptizing* them;——and in the declaration that children are holy;——and should be suffered to come to Christ the Head of the Church, because they are of the kingdom of heaven, which is the church. He who shall prove these, shews a divine command, although it is not what my Opponent calls an *express* command.

Neither is this necessary in matters of doctrine or practice, government or worship. It is well known that Socinians deny that there is an express revelation of the doctrine of a *Trinity in Unity*, because these words are not in the bible in this connexion: yet if it

can be proved from the bible that the Father is God, and the Son is God, and that the Holy Spirit is God, and that these are not three Gods but one God, the doctrine is more firmly established than it would be by the express words, *Trinity in Unity*. They also deny the vicarious satisfaction of Christ for the same reason: yet if it can be shewn that he was cut off for sins not his own, and this to magnify God's law and make it honorable, the doctrine is as fully proved as if the atonement had been expressly defined by the words *vicarious satisfaction*. There is not in the scriptures, an *express* prohibition of duelling nor of lotteries, nor of gaming of any sort; nor is there an *express* license for eating swine's flesh; neither is there any need of such *express* statutes, for the scriptures are plain enough without them. Where do the Baptists get an *express* command for their independent form of Church government? When they will shew us a text saying, *Ye shall be Independents, and not Presbyterians*, then I will shew one which says expressly, *Ye shall be Pedobaptists, and not Anabaptists*. Where do pious Baptists find an *express* command for the observance of family prayer and the Christian sabbath, which they love, and my Opponent despises? They would as soon look for an *express* command for drawing their breath: and rather than relinquish their domestic and sabbatical privileges, they would, like Daniel, give up their breath.

On this subject my Opponent was completely posed by Mr. Walker, his former Antagonist. My Opponent asked him, "Was there ever a positive ordinance or "institution founded solely upon inference or reason?"

In reply, Mr Walker, on his part asked, "Have we a positive command for all the acknowledged institutions of the church?" This was a true Socratic refutation. It was so puzzling to my Opponent, that he chose not to record it in his report of the Debate; but, in its place, he recorded (according to a custom of his) another question which he manufactured for Mr. Walker, and which he thought he could more easily answer. The question which he made, is this; "I ask him for a positive command for the institution of a church." One would suppose that, as he had the forming of the question and the answer too, he would make the latter come up, at least, to the level of his own demands. But this he was very far from doing. You know that he will not allow any passage of scripture to be a divine command for infant baptism unless it has the word *infant* in it. It is also a *sine qua non* with him that it should have the word *baptism* in it. When Mr. Walker quoted authorities which were destitute of these words, my Antagonist indignantly answered as follows, viz. "Is it possible that my Opponent has no better support for his system? Is he obliged to prove a New Testament positive institution from the 17th Chapter of Genesis? from portions of scripture in which *baptism* is never mentioned? In all the scriptures he has yet adduced, *baptism* is not so much as once mentioned."(*d*)

Now let us see whether he has come up to his own demands in answering his own question, which he intended to make very easy. If a divine command for the

baptism of infants require the *express* mention of *baptism* and *infants*, then an *express* command for the institution of a church must at least mention the words *institution* and *church*. He sets about his answer with the bravery of Napoleon, when entering Moscow. He refers us to the passage where our Saviour commands his disciples to teach or *disciple* all nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things.^(e) This is, like Mr. Walker's authority for infant baptism, very good proof, but, like that, it is utterly destitute of those words which his Opponent considered necessary to constitute it an *express* command. Mr. Walker might, therefore, have answered, "Is it possible that my Opponent has no better support for his system? Is he obliged to prove the institution of a church from the 28th chapter of Matthew? from portions of scripture in which neither *institution* nor *church* is ever mentioned?" -

But he quotes another passage which has the word *church*, though it does not speak of its original institution, nor propound a command, but states a historical fact, that "The Lord added to the *church* daily such as should be saved."^(f) This he triumphantly closes with declaring, "Here there is a positive institution of a church, with the authority for it." We are not so much disposed to quarrel with this declaration as he is himself. Let us now compare his question with his answer, and with the rules which he has dictated in relation to such subjects. His question requires "a *positive*

^(e) Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. in the Spurious Debate with Mr. W. p. 51.

^(f) Acts ii. 47. in the Spurious Debate with Mr. W. p. 51.

“*command for the institution of a church.*” His answer states a historical fact, in which members were added to a church, without any express mention either of its charter or of its original institution. It seems peculiarly inconsistent for him to call this historical fact, (without a precept,) “a positive institution of a church,” in the close of a paragraph, which commences by defining a positive institution to be a particular precept. His own words are these, viz. “In positive institutions, all that we have to inquire after, is the meaning of the words of one *particular precept*, which, to an iota, we are bound to perform, in the manner in which it is commanded.” Now, I would ask, has Mr. Walker’s Opponent ever yet given us his “one particular precept, which, to an iota,” expressly gives “a positive command for the institution of a church,” in so many words, according to his own requisitions, and according to his own promise? If, then, he has not answered his own question, which he intended to make as easy as possible, it is no wonder that he has never answered Mr. Walker’s question, “Have we a positive command for all the acknowledged institutions of the church?”

Let it be remembered that this question of Mr. Walker’s was connected with one or two of his Opponent’s, which asked, “Was there ever a positive ordinance or institution founded solely upon inference or reason? Or can there be a positive institution, without a positive precept or precedent authorizing it.”(g) These questions are framed with an unfairness, which

says little in favour of their author's candour or of his cause. Have we ever professed that infant-baptism was "founded solely upon inference or reason?" Have we not always appealed to *positive precepts* and *precedents* of revelation for our authority? Neither do I see the danger of admitting, in the established meaning of the words, his favourite principle that "a limited commission implies a prohibition of such things as are not contained in it."^(h) We say that infant-baptism is contained in the commission, and therefore not prohibited by it: and we prove this in the same reasonable and scriptural way in which our Opponents prove the duty of female-communion. They do not find a passage of scripture which says expressly, "Females must commune;" yet they find evidence that Christ's believing disciples should commune; they therefore admit to that privilege such females as answer that description. This is a legitimate inference from authority which contains no *express* mention of females. Suppose a person inquiring whether the scriptures forbid him to demand from his brother a hundred per centum, per annum, interest on lent money. He is referred to Nehemiah v. 11, which forbids him to receive the *centesima*, which is one per cent. a month, or twelve per cent. a year. This does not expressly mention the ratio in question: yet it as really forbids that exorbitant usury, as it could do by mentioning the identical words. This is according to my Opponent's declaration, "that a man is not to reason "whether he is to be just or honest; but he may reason

(h) Spurious Debate with Walker, p. 209. with M'Calla, p. 114.

“ to know in what justice and honesty consist.”⁽ⁱ⁾ Thus he does not consider himself at liberty to reason whether believing disciples should commune or not, for this is settled by revelation; but he may reason to know in what faith and discipleship consist. This course my Opponent pursues, but he knows the consequences of it, as is evident from the declamatory vituperation with which his argument is bloated. In his spurious debate with Mr. Walker,^(j) he uses the following words, viz.

“ As to his second query concerning female communion,
 “ I have to observe that although sundry Pedobaptists
 “ have made a salvo to soothe their minds, of this apparent difficulty, it is a poor and a pitiful come off; it is
 “ the most puerile and childish retort that I ever heard
 “ used by adults that had any knowledge of words and
 “ things. Was the Lord’s supper instituted to men or
 “ women as such? Was it not appointed to the disciples of Christ? ‘ He gave it to his disciples, saying,
 “ partake ye *all* of it.’ Here then is an express warrant for all disciples to participate of the Lord’s supper. Now it puts Mr. Walker, and all Pedobaptists
 “ that humble themselves to such means to support their
 “ cause, to prove or to show, that a woman is not a disciple of Christ. But should they attempt this, I have
 “ express authority to shew that they oppose the oracles
 “ of heaven, for a woman is expressly called a disciple,
 “ Acts ix. 36. ‘ For there was a certain disciple there
 “ named Tabitha;’ so that these obstacles thrown in my
 “ way, are but means to afford a clearer and fuller illus-

(i) Spurious Debate with Mr. Walker, p. 50.

(j) p. 69.

“tration and confirmation of the truth of my reasoning
“on positive institutions.”

“*My reasoning on positive institutions*” !!! So it seems that Pedobaptists are not the only ones who reason on positive institutions. You have just now heard a specimen of my Opponent’s reasoning on these subjects. It would be well if all his reasonings were as correct as that which supports female communion, for which he is not able to find what he calls an *express* command. His pretending that Mr. Walker is opposed to this argument is pretence only. He knows that we admit his inference as legitimate ; but he knows also, that the same argument about discipleship will establish infant-baptism. In our Saviour’s commission, “teach all nations, baptizing them,” critics generally interpret the word rendered *teach*, as meaning *disciple*, or *make disciples of*. My Opponent says, “This is unquestionably the proper rendering of the term.”(k) Pedobaptists have often proved, and, in due time, I hope to prove, in this debate, that the scriptures recognize the discipleship not only of Tabitha, or of Lydia, but of their households, and of the infants of all believers. And here it will not do to object that if infants are disciples, they must partake of the supper also, on account of a supposed universality in our Saviour’s command to his disciples, “Partake ye *all* of it.” So far is this command from requiring us to administer the supper to d.sciples of all ages, that it does not bind us to administer it to adult believing disciples universally, since the discipline of Christ’s

(k) Spurious Debate with me, p. 113.

own appointment sometimes cuts them off from this privilege.

But while my Opponent may be marshalling objections, I would remind him that his own argument, which is admitted to be good, is liable to as serious objections as any which he urges against ours. When we give divine authority for the administration of the seal of the righteousness of faith to infant disciples as well as adult believers, he objects that circumcision never was the seal of the righteousness of faith in any case except that of Abraham only, because the only instance in which this expression is used is in connexion with his name. If this mode of expounding the scriptures be admitted, how will my Opponent's argument for female communion fare in the hands of a bold objector? Recollect that it rests upon female discipleship, and female discipleship, according to my Opponent, rests upon the discipleship of Tabitha. The objector, therefore, would take my Opponent on his own ground, and say, As circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith to Abraham only, and to no other male, so discipleship was attached to Tabitha only, and to no other female!!

Again; when we say, *If* disciples should be baptized, and *if* the infants of believers are disciples, then these infants should be baptized, my logical Opponent laughs at our *ifs*, and would make you believe that sound logic does not recognize hypothetical syllogisms at all! Yet, strange to tell! his boasted argument for female communion is virtually a hypothetical syllogism. It is as follows:

If disciples should commune ; and
If females be disciples, then
 Females should commune : but
 Disciples should commune ; and
 Females are disciples ; therefore
 Females should commune.

Now in all this, where is my Opponent's *express* command for female communion? His vapouring argument does not even assert it : but only says that he has " an *express* warrant for all *disciples* to participate of " the Lord's supper ;" after which he has to shew that females are disciples. So we have an *express* warrant for baptizing disciples ; and we prove from scripture that believers and their infants are subjects of this discipling and baptizing. When my Opponent pursues this method of reasoning to establish the duty and privilege of female communion, he would think it a breach of the ninth commandment, for any one to tell him that he held " a positive ordinance or institution, founded solely upon inference or reason," " without a positive precept." His argument proves that there is a divine precept, though not what he calls an *express* command. He proves that the duty in question is not founded solely upon reason, but upon revelation. That there is the same authority for infant-baptism, must be fairly concluded from the establishment of the following propositions.

1. Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God.

2. The Christian Church is a branch of the Abrahamic Church : or, in other words, the Jewish Society before

Christ, and the Christian Society after Christ, are one and the same Church, in different dispensations.

3. Jewish Circumcision before Christ, and Christian Baptism, after Christ, are one and the same seal in substance, though in different forms.

4. The administration of this seal to infants was once enjoined by divine authority ; that is, God once commanded it.

5. The administration of this seal to infants has never since been prohibited by divine authority ; that is, this command of God, originally given in the Old Testament, is not repealed in the New Testament, but rather confirmed.

Therefore, this command is still in force. And as it is a command to administer to infants the initiatory seal of the church, which, under the Christian dispensation, is baptism, there is now a divine command for baptizing the infants of believers. Admit the premises, and the conclusion is inevitable. Whether these propositions be loved or feared, hated or revered, derided or respected, they necessarily involve the conclusion. Logic may exhibit its sophistry, rhetoric its rage, satire its wit, and vulgarity its scurrility, but if these premises be true, infant-baptism is a duty. My Opponent knows that if he were to admit the truth of these propositions, he would lose his cause at once. He therefore disputes them ; and I therefore, with a good conscience, and depending on divine help, proceed to prove them.

PROPOSITION I.

ABRAHAM AND HIS SEED WERE DIVINELY CONSTITUTED A
VISIBLE CHURCH OF GOD.

Many Baptists, such as Booth, Butterworth, and Judson, appear as if they could adopt this proposition just as it stands. The second of these writers, in his Concordance, gives, as the fourth meaning of the word *Church*, “*The people of the JEWS, who was the CHURCH and people of God.*” In proof of this he refers to Acts vii. 38, which says, “This is he that was in the *church* in the wilderness.” A person who is unacquainted with the ways of my Opponent, might suppose, from some of his declarations, that he also believed this doctrine. He has even accused Dr. Rallston of misrepresentation for denying it. In his Strictures at the end of his spurious Debate with Mr. Walker, (1) he speaks as follows, viz. “Mr. R. affirms that I ‘deny that there was a visible church in the world until the day of Pentecost.’ He “refers to no page in the Debate, nor could he, for there “is not such a declaration in the whole book. Nay, so “far is the above from fact, that I again and again speak “of a visible church in the world from Moses’ time to “the day of Pentecost. Page 26, I called the Jews “God’s people, and spoke of their visible church state : “so also in pages 40, 41, 43, 44, 53, 98, I spoke of the “Jewish church, and of their visible church state ; and

(1) p. 223.

“repeatedly contrasted the Jewish Church with the Christian Church—Yet Mr R. affirms that I denied “there was a visible church on earth till the day of Pentecost! !” From this, one would suppose that it was a settled opinion with my Opponent that the Jewish people were long the visible church of God, and that he was much in the habit of insisting upon this point; and that he had especially urged this doctrine in the many pages to which he refers. The last of these references must be a mistake, as it does not contain a word upon the subject. If the first of them prove the ecclesiastical state of the Jews, it goes far to shew their identity with the Christian church. But this could not have been his meaning, since it is in direct opposition to the two succeeding references. His second and third are occupied about Stephen’s “church in the wilderness,” which Butterworth, an eminent Baptist preacher, agrees with Mr. Walker, in considering “the people of the *Jews*, who was the *church* and people of God.” This my Opponent disputes in the places referred to, by trying to prove that the word translated *church* may mean a *mob*, like that of Demetrius, at Ephesus, instead of a *church* of God! This is a curious way to prove the visible church state of the Jews. The only remaining reference in the whole list is of a piece with these. Instead of saying, as he pretends, that the Jews were the visible church of God, he tries to prove that they were not the Church of Christ, by an argument which, if true, must go equally to prove that they could not be the church of God, unless he could shew that the latter was a different and inferior being to the former. It is evident

from his whole book, that he is far from being friendly to the doctrine in question, so that instead of Dr. Rallston's misrepresenting him, he has really misrepresented himself.

It is true that he has, in this debate, offered to concede the point, provided that I will pass on without taking up time in proving it. This, however, has turned out nothing more than a *ruse de guerre*, to induce me to leave an enemy's garrison in the rear. For when he was called upon to fulfil a stipulation which was of his own asking, he refused, and offered to substitute something of a very different character, viz. "That the Jews, when called out of Egypt, became a church, or a religious assembly in some sense."^(m)——"*a church, or a religious assembly in some sense.*" In what sense, pray? His debate with Mr. Walker tells us. It is in that sense in which the very religious assembly at Ephesus was a church; that assembly which was convened and opened with a Hymn by the zealous Demetrius, and, after much noise and bodily exercise, addressed and dismissed by his Reverence the town-clerk.

But this pretended concession denies that the Jews were a church or a religious assembly in any sense, till called out of Egypt. In accordance with this, he asserts that "they were never called *a church* until in the wilderness. This," says he, "may be denied, but there lives not the man that can produce an instance to the contrary." He farther assures us, that "the occurrences at Sinai are ever afterwards referred to by

(m) Spurious Debate with me p. 386.

“ Jewish and Christian Prophets as the commencement
 “ of their ecclesiastic existence. The covenant at
 “ Sinai, therefore, is the only national or ecclesiastic
 “ covenant from Adam to the Messiah, recorded in the
 “ Bible.”⁽ⁿ⁾ That the Sinaitic covenant is the consti-
 tution of the Jewish Church, (if church he will permit
 it to be called,) my Opponent endeavours to prove by
 two positions. One is that “ the occurrences at Sinai
 “ are ever afterwards referred to by Jewish and Christian
 “ Prophets as the commencement of their ecclesiastic
 “ existence.” As this language plainly intimates that
 the Old and New Testaments are full of evidence to this
 effect, you might reasonably expect the author of so bold
 an assertion to specify a few instances: but he has not
 here given one; and (to use his own language) I can
 safely say, “ there lives not the man that can produce
 “ an instance.” His other argument or assertion that
 “ they were never called *a church* until in the wilder-
 “ ness,” “ at Sinai,” is as irrelevant as it is incorrect.
 It goes upon the assumption that churches are made by
 names and not by acts. It is only a few years since the
 name of Baptists was given to any body of men on earth;
 for even the followers of John were not called Baptists.
 Is my Opponent willing to admit that they are no older
 than their name? Again; “ the disciples were called
Christians first in Antioch.” Were there no *Christians*
 at all, until this name was given to them? This shews
 the utter irrelevancy of the argument that the Jews
 “ were never called *a church* until” the Sinaitic cove-

(n) Spurious Debate, p. 398.

nant, even if this statement were true, which it assuredly is not, although he has affirmed it so roundly. I will not say that our translation of the Old Testament calls them *a church* before their arrival at Sinai ; but neither does it call them a church subsequent to that period. It is remarkable that our translators generally make *congregation* in the Old Testament correspond with *church* in the New. This is very much condemned by Dr. George Campbell, my Opponent's favourite critic, who says that "they ought constantly to have rendered "the original expression either *church* in the Old "Testament or *congregation* in the New." "What I "blame, therefore," says he, "in our translators, is the "want of uniformity." In the same connexion, the Dr. repeatedly declares that "the Hebrew word קהל [rendered *congregation* in the Old Testament] exactly corresponds to the Greek ἐκκλησία" [rendered *church* in the New Testament.](o) Although Dr. Campbell belonged to a Pedobaptist church, I adduce his authority without fear of opposition, because, in the passages quoted, he is, as usual, an advocate for Baptist peculiarities, in opposition to the creed which he had solemnly adopted. A work, however, which my Opponent has quoted against us,(p) states, in the very passages which he has read with approbation, the same thing substantially which Dr. Campbell has declared, with this addition, that another Hebrew word עדה is upon the same footing with קהל, since both alike are, in our

(o) See his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. Lecture 10. Pages 163. 164. Philadelphia Edition of 1807.

(p) Dr. Mason on the Church.

bible, rendered *congregation*, and both alike are used to signify the *church*.

Now it is very easy for my Opponent to prove that they were called and considered a visible church after their arrival at Sinai, by such passages as Lev. iv. 14, 21, where it is said that “^להקהל *the church* shall offer a young bullock for the sin, and bring him before the tabernacle of ^לנוער *the church*,” as “a sin-offering for ^להקהל *the church*.” It is certainly the true church of God that is here intended, and not a mob like that of Ephesus. But before this church had come to Sinai, or even left Egypt, it is said in Ex. xii. 6, concerning the sacrifice of the Passover, that “the whole ^לעדת *assembly of the church, or church of the congregation* of Israel shall kill it in the evening.” Concerning this also it may be said that the true church of God is here intended, and not a mob like that at Ephesus. An examination of Lev. viii. 3. xvi. 5, with the context, will shew plainly that, after their arrival at Sinai, the Israelites were called ^לעדה *the church* in the ecclesiastical sense of the word; for they are represented as engaged in ecclesiastical business. But in Ex. xii. 3, 47, the same people are twice called by the same name, and represented as engaged in the same business, before they had set out on their journey to Mount Sinai. After that period, their discipline ordained that “the man that shall “be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul “shall be cut off from among ^להקהל *the church*.”(q) But before they left Egypt, it was similarly ordained con-

(q) Num. xix. 20.

cerning the Passover, that “whosoever eateth that
 “which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off
 “*לִישְׂרָאֵל מֵעֵדָה* *from the church of Israel.*” (r)

It will be recollected that my Opponent referred to an instance in which he “called the Jews God’s people” as a proof that he believed in “their visible church state.”(s) According to this, “God’s people” must mean *the church of God*. What is here plainly implied by my Opponent, is expressly declared by Dr. George Campbell, in a Lecture which is intended to build congregationalism (the Baptist form of Government) on the ruins of Presbyterianism. After pointing out several expressions as “confessedly equivalent” to each other, he adds, “The same may be said of the phrases קהל
 “*עַם אֱלֹהִים* and *עַם אֱלֹהִים*, ἡ ἐκκλησία θεοῦ and ὁ λαὸς θεοῦ
 “*the church of God and the people of God.*”(t) This was evidently the understanding of Butterworth, the Baptist writer, when he called the Jews “the church and people of God.” This is in conformity with Lev. xvi. 33, which says “He shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the *עַם הַקֹּהֵל*, *people of the church.*” Moses uses the word *people* alone, in a sense which cannot easily be misunderstood. “Whatsoever soul it be that
 “eateth any manner of blood, even that soul shall be
 “cut off from his *people.*”(a) The word *people* here evidently means the same *church* contemplated in Lev. xix. 20, and Ex. xii. 9, from which church it is ordained that a soul shall be cut off for eating leavened bread, and

(r) Exodus xii. 19.

(s) Spurious Debate with Mr. Walker, p. 223, quoted above.

(t) See his tenth Lecture on Ecclesiastical History, quoted above.

(a) Lev. vii. 27.

for neglecting to purify himself. And from premises which we have already shewn are admitted by Baptists and Pedobaptists, we fairly conclude that this visible church of God is meant by the *people* from whom the uncircumcised man-child is said to be cut off in Gen. xvii. 14. “And the uncircumcised man-child, whose
 “flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall
 “be cut off from his *people*; [that is, from his *church* ;]
 “he hath broken my covenant;” [that is my ecclesiastical covenant,] made four hundred and thirty years before my Opponent’s ecclesiastical covenant, at Sinai.

If I be not egregiously mistaken, my Opponent’s own argument operates with irresistible force against himself. He reasons that the Jews were not a church until they came to Sinai, because they were not called a church until that period. Then if they had been *called* a church before, this would prove that they were really a church before the Sinaitic covenant. But we have shewn several proofs that they were called a church, in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, before they left Egypt, and we have shewn that they were called by a name “confessedly equivalent” in the covenant with Abraham, where the violation of that covenant is given as a reason for excommunication from that church. This subject we hope, with divine permission, to pursue farther before we are done with the proposition that “Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God.”

When we speak of Abraham’s SEED, take notice that this is the language which the scriptures use on this very subject. God says to Abraham, “This is my covenant

“ which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy
 “ SEED after thee ; every man-child among you shall be
 “ circumcised.”(u) This term is not used to embrace
 the children of Hagar and Keturah. “ And God said,
 “ Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed ; and thou
 “ shalt call his name Isaac : and I will establish my co-
 “ venant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with
 “ HIS SEED after him.”(v) “ And God said unto Abra-
 “ ham, let it not be grievous in thy sight, because of the
 “ lad, and because of thy bond-woman ; in all that Sarah
 “ hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice : for in
 “ Isaac shall thy SEED be called.”(w) “ Neither be-
 “ cause they are the *seed* of Abraham, are they all chil-
 “ dren : but in Isaac shall thy SEED be called. That is,
 “ they which are the children of the flesh, these are not
 “ the children of God : but the children of the promise
 “ are counted for the seed.”(x)

This ecclesiastical SEED does not embrace the de-
 scendants of Isaac *universally*. Reprobate Esau, and,
 to a great degree, his progeny, were excluded, with
 every uncircumcised male of Jacob’s posterity, accord-
 ing to Gen. xvii. 14. Moreover, the excommunication
 of even circumcised persons must have sometimes occur-
 red. Instances are mentioned in the New Testament.(y)
 At an earlier period, Ezra proclaimed a general meet-
 ing, from which, if any man were absent, “ all his sub-
 “ stance should be forfeited, and himself separated from
 “ the קהל *church* of those that had been carried away.”
 On this passage, Dr. Gill, the greatest Baptist Commem-

(u) Gen. xvii. 10.
 (x) Rom. ix. 7, 8.

(v) Gen. xvii. 19. (w) Gen. xxi. 12,
 (y) John ix. 22, comp. Luke vi. 22,

tator, says that the absentee from this meeting “should be excommunicated from them as a *church*, and be no more reckoned of the body politic, or a freeman of Israel, and so deprived of all privileges, both in church and state.”(z) That very excommunication which the Doctor says was here threatened, was afterward inflicted upon the great body of the Jewish people, the old branches of the ecclesiastical olive tree. Paul says, “because of unbelief they were broken off.”(a) If, therefore, there had been no engrafting of foreign cions, the church would have been nearly or altogether extinct.

We observe, therefore, that the ecclesiastical SEED did not embrace the descendants of Isaac *exclusively*. According to Moses, Edomites were permitted to “enter into the *קהל church* of the Lord in their third generation.”(b) In Isaiah,(c) God has promised great additions from Egypt and Assyria. And we are informed of the actual accession of Ebed-Melech, the Ethiopian, Rahab of Jericho, and Ruth the Moabiteess.(d) Besides this, there is an innumerable multitude whom Paul represents as saying “The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.”(e) Concerning these he says, “They which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham;”(f) upon the ground, that “to Abraham and his SEED were the promises made.”(g)

These materials afford the following definition, viz. The SEED of Abraham are his descendants in the line of

(z) Gill's Commentary on Ezra x. 8.

(b) Deut. xxiii. 7, 8.

(d) Jer. xxxviii. 7—12. Matt. i. 5.

(f) Gal. iii. 9.

(a) Rom. xi. 20.

(c) xix. 23, 24.

(e) Rom. xi. 19.

(g) Gal. iii. 16.

Isaac, in good standing as professors of the true religion, with others added to them. Substituting this periphrasis for the word SEED, in the proposition now under discussion, it will read as follows, viz. Abraham and his descendants, in the line of Isaac, in good standing as professors of the true religion, with others added to them, were divinely constituted a visible church of God.

It will, of course, be understood that the phrase *visible church* means a society, distinct from the body of the elect, and distinct from that portion of the elect who are already in glory. These are called the invisible church, and the church triumphant; from which the visible church, whether under the old or the new dispensation, is quite distinct. It is a visible society, acting as the consecrated depository of the oracles and ordinances of revealed religion. With the substitution of this explanation, for the phrase which it is intended to define, the proposition under consideration will read as follows, viz. Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible society, acting as the consecrated depository of the oracles and ordinances of revealed religion.

In oppugnation of this position, it will not avail to prove that the Jews were a body politic; for this is quite consistent with their being an ecclesiastical body also: and the fact of their being both a church and a state, is admitted in the extract just now given from the great Baptist commentator, Dr. Gill. It is equally futile to produce instances of a simultaneous tenure of civil and ecclesiastical offices; for this is quite common amongst us, where church and state are certainly

distinct. Neither will it do to alledge the moral turpitude of individual members against the existence of the Jewish, any more than the Christian church ; for spotless purity belongs to the church triumphant only, and even universal sincerity to the invisible church only. I would also wish you to remember that the question is not now concerning the sameness of the Jewish and Christian churches, but whether the Jews were a church at all. That they were, I shall endeavour to prove, by shewing that they had the qualifications and constituents of a church, in the following order :

1. The oracles of a church.
2. The ordinances.
3. The members.
4. The officers.
5. The constitution.
6. The inspired name of a church.

If all these points can be proved from the word of God, we shall have good reason for believing that Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God ; and we shall have advanced one step to the conclusion that a command given to him, for administering to infants the initiatory seal of the church, is still binding.

POINT I.

The Jews had the ORACLES of a visible Church of God.

Paul says, “ unto them were committed the *Oracles* of “ God.”(h) The character and design of these *oracles*

(h) Rom. iii. 2.

were evidently not those of a mere political code ; but to convey religious instruction, to testify of Christ, to give us hope, life, wisdom and salvation. Concerning them, Peter says, “ We have also a more sure word of
 “ prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as
 “ unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day
 “ dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.”(i) Paul says, “ From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures
 “ [of the Old Testament] which are able to make thee
 “ wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ
 “ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God,
 “ and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correc-
 “ tion, for instruction in righteousness ; that the man of
 “ God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all
 “ good works.”(j) John says, “ The testimony of Jesus
 “ is the spirit of prophecy.”(k) In addressing the Jews, our Saviour said, “ Search the scriptures ; for in them
 “ ye think ye have eternal life ; and they are they
 “ which testify of me.” “ For had ye believed Moses,
 “ ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me.”(l) When the rich man in hell besought the patriarch in heaven, to send an extraordinary messenger to his five brethren, “ Abraham saith unto him, they have Moses
 “ and the prophets ; let them hear them.” When the rich man repeated his request that one might arise from the dead, Abraham replied, “ If they hear not Moses
 “ and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded,
 “ though one rose from the dead.”(m) By the mouth of

(i) 2 Pet. i. 19. compare verses 20, 21. (j) 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

(k) Rev. xix. 10.

(l) John v. 39. 46.

(m) Luke xvi. 27—31.

Ezekiel, one of those prophets, God says, “I gave them
 “ my statutes, and shewed them my judgments, which,
 “ if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover,
 “ also, I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between
 “ me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord
 “ that sanctify them.”(n) The Psalmist says, “For he
 “ established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law
 “ in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they
 “ should make them known to their children, that the
 “ generation to come might know them, even the chil-
 “ dren which should be born, who should arise and
 “ declare them to their children, that they might set
 “ their hope in God, and not forget the works of God,
 “ but keep his commandments.”(o) On the declaration
 of the Psalmist, that “he established a testimony in
 “ Jacob,” the great Baptist commentator speaks as
 follows, viz. “This is established in the house of Jacob,
 “ (as the Targum ;) in the *church*, which is the pillar
 “ and ground of truth, among *the saints and people of*
 “ *God*, to whom it is delivered, and by whom it will be
 “ kept, and with whom it will remain throughout all
 “ ages, for it is the everlasting gospel.” It is pleasing
 to find such high Baptist authority as Dr. Gill, admitting
 that the Old Testament oracles contained the gospel,
 and that this testimony was committed to Jacob as a
church, as the saints and people of God.

(n) Ez. xx. 11, 12.

(o) Psalm lxxviii. 5—8

POINT II.

The Jews had the ORDINANCES of a visible Church of God.

“Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, [among which that with Abraham is prominent,] and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, [among whom Abraham holds a conspicuous place,] and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ [the substance of all the ordinances] came, who is over all, God blessed forever.”(*p*) Long before the transactions at Sinai, the covenant with Abraham recognized the ordinance of circumcision. “And God said unto Abraham, thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou and thy seed after thee, in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised.”(*q*) In the wilderness God gave them the manna which was a daily spiritual feast. “For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.”(*r*) On the words “evermore give us this bread,” Dr. Gill observes, “but to such who are true believers in Christ, who have tasted that the Lord is

(*p*) Rom. ix. 4, 5.

(*q*) Gen. xvii. 9, 10.

(*r*) John vi. 33—35.

“ gracious, Christ, the true manna and bread of God, is
 “ all things to them ; nor do they desire any other : they
 “ taste every thing that is delightful, and find every
 “ thing that is nourishing in him.” Paul connects this
 with the stream which quenched their thirst. “ And
 “ did all eat the same spiritual meat ; and did all drink
 “ the same spiritual drink : for they drank of that spi-
 “ ritual rock which followed them, and that Rock was
 “ Christ.”(s) On this passage, Dr. Gill remarks that
 “ Christ may be compared to the rock,” “ in the sup-
 port of *his church*,” “ as he is the foundation of *his*
church and every believer,” “ as the foundation of *his*
church, abiding forever.” Now compare the text and
 the Baptist commentary. The Apostle informs us that
 the Jews, long before the Christian dispensation, were
 supported by the spiritual Rock : the Commentator de-
 clares that those who were thus supported, stand in re-
 lation to Christ, as HIS CHURCH ; and the expression HIS
 CHURCH is thrice repeated in a few lines. If there be
 meaning in language, this points out the Jews before the
 New Testament day, as the church of Christ.

But my Opponent professes to produce New Testa-
 ment authority, to shew that the ordinances of the Jews
 were not such as should belong to the spiritual and hea-
 venly religion of the true God, but that they were
 worldly and carnal ordinances. Paul says, “ Then ve-
 “ rily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine
 “ service, and a *worldly* sanctuary.” “ Which stood
 “ only in meats and divers washings, and *carnal* ordi-

(s) † Cor. x. 3, 4.

“ nances imposed on them, until the time of reformation.”(t) To support him here, he adduces the translation and commentary of the learned Dr. Macknight, a celebrated Pedobaptist. It would be well for him to examine his notes, and see whether this is not a mistaken reference. Although the Dr. had a tender regard for almost all descriptions of error, he does not support my Opponent, on the point for which he is cited. The Dr. tells us that this *worldly* sanctuary was called so, “ not “ because it was a holy place on earth, and made of “ materials furnished from the earth, but because it was “ a representation of the world or universe.” It may surely be all this, and yet a proper sanctuary for the worship of the true God by his visible church. As for these *carnal* ordinances, he calls them “ *ordinances concerning the flesh*,” “ *respecting the purifying of the “ body*,” “ *literally, righteousnesses of the flesh*, things “ which make the flesh, not the spirit righteous.” These are his own words, in his translation, commentary, and notes. These words are correct, even where they oppose Dr. Magee’s opinion that, in some cases, the Jewish sacrifices make a real satisfaction to divine justice. On these and the various ordinances connected with them, I believe, with Dr. Gill, “ that they were all “ types and figures of Christ, and had their fulfilment in “ him.”(u) He shews that Philo, the Jew, explained this worldly sanctuary as Macknight does ; yet surely Philo believed the Jews to be a church. In opposition to them both, however, the Dr. says, “ It was rather

(t) Hebr. ix. 1. 10.

(u) On Hebr. ix. 1.

“ either a type of the church, or of heaven, or of
 “ Christ’s human nature : the better reason of its being
 “ so called is, because it consisted of earthly matter
 “ and worldly things ; it was in the world, and only had
 “ its use in the world, and so is opposed to the heavenly
 “ sanctuary.”^(u) None of these views have the least
 bearing against the doctrine that this worldly sanctuary
 is an ecclesiastical sanctuary, unless you will first prove
 that no church can exist in the world. But that we may
 not be at a loss concerning its ecclesiastical character,
 God said to Solomon, “ I have heard thy prayer, and
 “ have chosen this place to myself, for an house of
 “ sacrifice.” “ Now mine eyes shall be open, and mine
 “ ears attent unto thy prayer, that is made in this place.
 “ For now have I chosen and sanctified this house, that
 “ my name may be there forever : and mine eyes and
 “ mine heart shall be there perpetually.”^(v) If a holy
 residence of God, consecrated to sacrifice and prayer,
 is not dignified enough to be called an ecclesiastical
 sanctuary, I should like to know where you would find a
 church in our day. This doctrine was held by the
 Jews, in opposition to the Samaritans, down to the time
 of our Saviour, to whom the Samaritan woman applied
 to decide the controversy. This gave him an oppor-
 tunity of instructing her in the new dispensation, which
 has laid the dispute asleep almost ever since, until, in
 late days, it has been revived by some Baptists, who
 have a zeal not according to knowledge. Among those
 I am happy to find that the pious and learned Dr. Gill is

(u) On Hebr. ix. 1.

(v) 2 Chr. vii. 12, 15, 16.

not numbered. He comments upon the words of the Samaritan woman, as follows, viz. “ *And ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship; that is, in the temple there; who urged, and very rightly, that God had chosen that place to put his name, and fix his worship there; and had ordered them to come thither, and bring their offerings and sacrifices, and to keep their Passover and other feasts.*”(w)

POINT III.

The Jewish society had the MEMBERS of a visible church.

The ordinances of which we have been speaking, were emblematical of sanctification, and required evidence of sanctification in their adult communicants. It is true that this is a thing of which my Opponent has no very high opinion, as he scoffs at the very Baptists themselves, for requiring of candidates some account of their religious experience, preparatory to initiation. But with pious Baptists this is esteemed important. So do the scriptures esteem it important in the subjects of circumcision. “Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your hearts, and be no more stiff-necked.”(x) “The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the lord thy God, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.”(y) “All these nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the

(w) Gill on John iv. 20. For proof he refers to Deut. xii. 5. 6. xvi. 2.

(x) Deut. x. 16.

(y) Deut. xxx. 6.

“ heart.”(z) “ Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost ; as your fathers did, so do ye.”(a) “ And thou shalt say to the rebellious, even to the house of Israel, thus saith the Lord God, O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations, in that ye have brought into my sanctuary strangers, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, even my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant, because of all your abominations.”(b)

It is one glorious feature of the visible church, that it requires evidence of regeneration in those who are candidates for membership. The scriptures which have just now been read, plainly shew that the Jewish society had this feature of a church : for, according to these texts, they violated the constitution of the church, whenever they received proselytes without evidence of piety. This is so conspicuously the spirit of these passages, that I know no way of escaping their force, but by proving that they are not intended for the literal Israel, but that they are prophecies exclusively applicable to the Christian church. Dr. Gill says that the last authority which I have quoted (Ez. xliv. 6, 7.) “ well agrees with these declining churches in the latter day, and even in our times :” yet, unhappily for my opponent, the Dr. says at the same time, that the picture there given “ is a character of literal Israel from the beginning.” The Dr. tells us that they are con-

(z) Jer. ix. 26.

(b) Ez. xliv. 6, 7.

(a) Acts vii. 51.

demned for introducing “strangers,” because they are “unregenerate men, who are in a state of alienation and “estrangement to divine and spiritual things.” The “uncircumcised in heart,” whom they were forbidden to receive as members, Dr. Gill understands to be those “who never were pricked in the heart for sin, or felt any “pain there on account of it; never had the hardness “of their heart removed, or the impurity of it discovered to them; never were filled with shame and “loathing because of it; or ever put off the body of “sins in a course of conversation; or renounced their “own righteousness.” This last text censures the church for polluting the sanctuary by the introduction of persons who were even uncircumcised in flesh. These, the Dr. says, were “carnal as they were born; “men in the flesh, in a state of nature, mind and savour “the things of the flesh, and do the works of it; having “never been taught by the grace of God, to deny un- “godliness and worldly lusts, and to abstain from fleshly “ones: or who put their trust in the flesh, in outward “things, in carnal privileges, and external righteousness. These the Lord complains were brought *to be “in my sanctuary, to pollute it, even my house; either “to be members here, and partake of all the ordinances “and privileges of the Lord’s house; or to officiate “here as priests and ministers of the Lord.”* According to these words of Dr. Gill, he must have thought, that evidence of regeneration was as requisite to membership in the Lord’s house, under the Old Testament dispensation, as under the New. No wonder then, that he thought the Jews a church. This opinion is confirm-

ed in the New Testament, by the allusions which it makes to the Old; “and you being dead in your sins, “and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he “quickened together with him, having forgiven you all “trespasses.”(c)

On this subject I would wish you attentively to read, and devoutly to consider Psalm l. 7—23. On the first of these verses, which begins, “Hear O my people,” Dr. Gill remarks, “This is an address to the people of “the Jews, whom God had chosen to be *his people* above “all others, and who professed themselves to be *his people*; but a *lo-ammi* was about to be written upon “them, being a people uncircumcised in heart and ears, “refusing to hear the great prophet of the *church*, him “that spake from heaven.” Here *people* and *church* are used synonymously, as they are by my Opponent; and the Jews are justly said to be, by their own profession, and the choice of God, *his people*; and Christ is said to be the prophet of their *church*, as well as of the New Testament church.

I have the same request to make concerning your perusal of Is. i. 10—20. The ninth verse predicts the destruction of Jerusalem, which threatened an utter extinction of God’s people, “except the Lord had left “unto us a very small remnant.” “And this,” says Dr. Gill, “was done *unto us*, for the sake of his *church*, “that that might continue, and he might have a seed to “serve him.” Here the Dr. considers the Christian “dispensation a continuance of the us to whom Isaiah

belonged ; and this us he calls a *church*. The context to which I have referred you, shews that its members were called to the same holiness which is required in Christians. Thus does Dr. Gill explain God's command by Moses, that the Jews should be "an holy nation." (d) He says that it means "being separated from all others, "and devoted to the worship and service of God, having "holy laws and holy ordinances, and a holy service, "and a holy place to perform it in, and holy persons to "attend unto it, as they afterwards had." The same great Baptist writer declares the "holy seed" mentioned by Ezra,(e) to be "such as the Lord had separated "from other nations, chosen them to be an holy people "above all others, and devoted them to his service and "worship." When the most excellent of the Baptist denomination speak thus of the Jews ; but especially when the holy and infallible word of God speaks thus of the constitutional obligations of members of the Jewish society, can you wonder at us for calling them a visible church?

POINT IV.

The Jewish society had the OFFICERS of a visible church.

The priesthood was an office consecrated to ecclesiastical purposes, and therefore was guarded from intrusion by severe penalties. After the earth had swallowed up Korah, Dathan and Abiram, "There came out a fire "from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and

(d) Ex. xix. 6.

(e) ix. 2.

“ fifty men that offered incense.”(*f*) “ And the anger
 “ of the Lord was kindled against Uzza, and God smote
 “ him there for his error, and there he died by the ark
 “ of God.”(*g*) “ And they withstood Uzziah the king,
 “ and said unto him, it appertaineth not unto thee,
 “ Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the
 “ priests, the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to
 “ burn incense: go out of the sanctuary; for thou hast
 “ trespassed; neither shall it be for thine honour from
 “ the Lord God.”(*h*)

There is a very great contrast between my Opponent and the old fashioned Baptists, about the officers of the church, and the manner in which they shall be supported. My Opponent is for putting down the clergy at a blow, as not only unworthy of being maintained by the church, but unworthy of any distinction by ministerial ordination. He is as complete a leveller as any infidel. This arises not from any love for liberty and equality, but from a desire to monopolize in his own person, all that influence which is now divided among the clergy of his own denomination and others, and from a desire to pervert to the destruction of souls that influence which they should use for edification. His way to scatter the sheep is to smite the shepherd. Not so our good old Dr. Gill, who, in every thing except public disputation, is worth a thousand of him. In commenting upon one of Ezekiel's appropriations for the priests, he says, “ This holy portion of land, ex-
 “ cepting that which is for the sanctuary, is to be for the

(*f*) Num. xvi. 35.
 (*h*) 2 Chr. xxvi. 18.

(*g*) 2 Sam. vi. 7.

“ use of the priests, to build houses to dwell in ; signi-
 “ fying that the ministers of the gospel are to be taken
 “ care of, and sufficient provision made for their main-
 “ tenance.”(i) In another place he speaks of “ the
 “ ministers of the gospel, who shall have a sufficient
 “ maintenance from the churches of Christ, as the
 “ priests had under the law.” This last is on a verse
 in which the prophet mentions a spot which “ shall be a
 “ place for their houses,” on which the Dr. observes,
 “ In this large spot shall be many congregated *churches*,
 “ houses of the living God, where his priests and peo-
 “ ple dwell, and will be serving and praising him.”(j)
 On a similar subject, a little before this, he says,
 “ These [chambers] were for holy persons to dwell in,
 “ and for holy things to be done in, as the *churches* of
 “ Christ are ; they consist of holy persons, men called
 “ with a holy calling, and in them the holy word of
 “ God is preached, and holy ordinances administer-
 “ ed.”(k) Thus does the existence of ecclesiastical
 officers in the Jewish society, prove them to be a visible
 church ; and thus does the best Baptist authority admit
 that they were as real a church “ as the churches of
 Christ are.”

POINT V.

The Jewish Society had the CONSTITUTION of a visible church.

Whatsoever may have been said to Abraham and his
 seed concerning temporal and political blessings, God's

(i) Ez. xlviii. 10.

(k) Ez. xlii. 13.

(j) Ez. xlv. 4.

covenant with them did, nevertheless, contemplate eternal, spiritual, and ecclesiastical favours. “ And I
 “ will establish my covenant between me and thee,
 “ and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for
 “ an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and
 “ to thy seed after thee : and I will give unto thee and
 “ to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a
 “ stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting pos-
 “ session, and I will be their God.”(*l*) “ Now therefore,
 “ if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my cove-
 “ nant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me,
 “ above all people, for all the earth is mine ; and ye
 “ shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy
 “ nation.”(*m*) “ The chariots of God are twenty
 “ thousand, even thousands of angels, the Lord is among
 “ them, as in Sinai, in the holy place ; thou hast as-
 “ cended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou
 “ hast received gifts for men, yea, even for the rebel-
 “ lious also, that the Lord might dwell among them.
 “ Blessed be the Lord which daily loadeth us with
 “ benefits, even the God of our salvation. Selah. He
 “ that is our God is the God of salvation ; and unto God
 “ the Lord belong the issues from death.”(*n*) “ He
 “ sent redemption unto his people, he hath commanded
 “ his covenant forever ; Holy and reverend is his
 “ name.”(*o*) “ For he remembered his holy promise,
 “ and Abraham his servant, and he brought forth his
 “ people with joy, and his chosen with gladness.”(*p*)
 “ Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited

(*l*) Gen. xvii. 7. 8.
 (*o*) Ps. cxi. 9.

(*m*) Ex. xix. 5. 6.
 (*p*) Ps. cv. 42. 43.

(*n*) Ps. lxviii. 17—20

“and redeemed his people;” “to perform the mercy
 “promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy
 “covenant, the oath which he sware to our Father
 “Abraham.”(q)

Among the authorities just now quoted, one of them mentions Sinai : but it will be observed that it does not refer to the transactions at Sinai, for the origin of the church. Yet that very passage proves that the Jews were a church. It is in this capacity “that the Lord
 “God” promises to “dwell among them;” “that is,” says Dr. Gill, “that they by the gifts and graces of the
 “Spirit bestowed on them, might become a fit habitation
 “for God; or that *they*, the rebellious, being now
 “partakers of the grace of God and his gifts, *might*
 “*dwell with the Lord God* IN HIS CHURCHES; enjoy
 “his divine presence, and have communion with him
 “in his *word* and *ordinances*.” The salvation mentioned in the very next verse, Dr. Gill does not fritter down to a mere temporal deliverance, but calls it “temporal, spiritual, and eternal salvation.”(r) It is true that Gill calls the redemption mentioned in one of the texts,(s) a “temporal redemption, as typical of the
 “spiritual and eternal one;” but in another of these texts, he believes the spiritual and eternal redemption to be meant, and the typical one only alluded to. The following are his words, viz. “*For he hath visited and*
 “*redeemed his people*, as he did Israel of old, Ex. iii. 16, 17, when the Lord looked upon them, and delivered them out of the bondage of Egypt, and which

(q) Luke i. 68. 72. 73. (r) Gill on Ps. lxxviii. 18. 19. (s) Ps. cxi. 9.

“ was a type and resemblance of redemption by Christ,
 “ and to which reference here seems to be had.” But
 although the redemption here contemplated, refers to a
 temporal deliverance, the Dr. says that it “ intends the
 “ spiritual and eternal redemption of them by the price
 “ of his blood, from the slavery of sin ; the bondage of
 “ the law, and curse of it, and the captivity of Satan,
 “ and a deliverance out of the hands of every enemy ;
 “ a redemption which reaches both to soul and body,
 “ and secures from all condemnation and wrath to come ;
 “ and includes every blessing in it, as justification,
 “ forgiveness of sins, adoption, sanctification, and
 “ eternal life, and is a plenteous, full, complete, and
 “ everlasting one.”(t)

It is plain, then, that the redemption here mentioned
 is not merely a temporal or political one, but a spiritual
 and eternal redemption. It is also plain that it is con-
 ferred upon God’s “ *people*,” a word which my Oppo-
 nent considers equivalent to *church*. The text more-
 over informs us that this was done, “ to perform the
 mercy promised to our fathers,” not at Mount Sinai, but
 “ to remember his *holy covenant*, the oath which he
 “ sware to our father Abraham ;” many hundred years
 before the transactions at Sinai.

It is in reference to this *holy covenant*, that Moses
 said to Israel, “ thou art an *holy people*.” “ Not sanc-
 “ tified” says Dr. Gill, “ in a spiritual sense, or having
 “ principles of grace and holiness in them, from whence
 “ holy actions sprang, at least, not all of them ; but

“ they were separated from all other people in the
 “ world to the pure worship and service of God in an
 “ external manner, and therefore were to avoid all
 “ idolatry and every appearance of it.” The remain-
 der of the verse which speaks of their being chosen to
 be a *special people*, the Dr. understands to mean “ for
 “ special service and worship, and to enjoy special
 “ privileges and benefits, civil and *religious*.”(u)
 Elsewhere, when Moses speaks of their being “ an *holy*
 “ *people* unto the Lord,” Gill explains it, “ set apart
 “ by him from all other people, and devoted to his
 “ worship and service, and many of them were sancti-
 “ fied and made holy in a special and spiritual sense.”
 The remainder of the verse calls them a *peculiar peo-
 ple*. Gill explains this peculiarity as consisting “ espe-
 “ cially in things *sacred*.”(v) My aim is to prove from
 scripture, that Abraham and his seed have the constitu-
 tion of a visible church ; that is, that they were a conse-
 crated depository of the oracles and ordinances of revealed
 religion. Dr. Gill has proved from scripture, that they
 were “ set apart” as a *holy people*, a *special people*, a
peculiar people, “ especially in things sacred” and
 “ religious :” all this, too, upon the constitution of “ his
holy covenant, the oath which he swore to our father
 Abraham.” They were therefore a church.

(u) Gill on Ex. vii. 6.

(v) Gill on Ex. xiv. 2.

POINT VI.

*The Jewish society had the express, inspired, and unequivocal
NAME of a church.*

These points are professedly intended to support the proposition that “ Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God.” Soon after that proposition was announced, some remarks were made, and more were promised, on the *name* of a church. My farther progress on this subject, my Opponent has endeavoured to obstruct by the authority of Dr. Mason, who has the appearance of being against me. He speaks as follows, viz. “ The word *church*, derived from the “ Greek, *κκλησιον*, signifies *the house of the Lord*, “ and marks the property which he has in it. But the “ original words which it is employed to translate, signify a different thing. The Hebrew words קהל and עדה in the Old Testament, and the corresponding one “ *ἐκκλησια* in the New, all signify *an assembly*, especially one convened by invitation or appointment. “ That this is their generic sense, no scholar will deny ; “ nor that their particular applications are ultimately “ resolvable into it. Hence it is evident that from the “ terms themselves nothing can be concluded as to the “ nature and extent of the assembly which they denote. “ Whenever either of the two former occurs in the Old “ Testament, or the other in the New, you are sure of “ *an assembly*, but of nothing more. What that assembly is, and whom it comprehends, you must learn “ from the *connexion* of the term, and the *subject* of

“the writer.” (*w*) The Dr. then proceeds to give instances of the diversified application of these several words.

When this eminent scholar observes that we must learn the meaning of the word “from the *connexion* of the term, and the *subject* of the writer,” he says what is true not only of the word *church*, but of those words which all will confess to have been reduced from their *generic* signification to an *appropriate* meaning. This remark may be elucidated by the title of the most distinguished officer in the church. It is the word *apostle*. Concerning this, we may say as Dr. Mason has of *church*, “What an *Apostle* is, and whom it points out, whether “an ordinary or extraordinary agent, whether Christ, “one of the twelve, or any other person, *you must learn from the connexion of the term, and the subject of the writer.*” The Greek word signifies a messenger. (*x*) “That this is its generic sense, no scholar will deny, nor that its particular applications are ultimately resolvable into it. Hence it is evident that from the term itself, nothing can be concluded as to the character of the messenger which it denotes. Whenever it occurs in the Old or New Testament, you are sure of a messenger, but of nothing more.”

After thus applying all Dr. Mason’s remarks to the word *apostle* as well as *church*, suppose a question to arise concerning the apostleship of Paul, as one has arisen concerning the ecclesiastical standing of the Jews. Was

(*w*) Mason on the Church. pp. 8—10. Christian’s Magazine, vol. 1. pp. 54—56.

(*x*) See Phil. ii. 25. and 1 Kings xiv. 6, in the Greek.

Paul an ordinary *messenger* of ordinary matters, from one ordinary man to another; or was he an extraordinary, spiritual, ecclesiastical *Apostle* of Jesus Christ? I say that he was the latter, and I very naturally try to prove it, by shewing that the scriptures apply to him the express, inspired, and unequivocal *name* of an *Apostle*. This conclusion is so far from being forbidden by Dr. Mason's remarks, that it is attained in the very way which he points out, "from the *connexion* of the term, and the *subject* of the writer." From these we plainly see that the term is applied to Paul, not in its *generic* sense, but in its *appropriate* meaning. It points him out, not as an ordinary, secular messenger from man, but as an inspired ecclesiastical messenger from our divine Redeemer. Shall we say then, that his being so called, in such a connexion, is no evidence of his *apostleship*, in the highest sense in which the term is applied to men? Shall we say that the mere fact that a word originally has a *generic* sense, shall forever disqualify it from pointing out a particular object? Shall we say, that because it has a variety of meanings, it can have no definite meaning at all? If so, then let us be consistent, and openly relinquish the common and well established proof of Christ's divinity, from the fact that the express, inspired, and unequivocal *name* of God is applied to him in the scriptures. But if we admit, as all real Christians do, that the application of this name to Christ, proves him to be the true God; and that the application of another name to Paul, proves him to be an *apostle* of God; then the application of a third name to the Jews will prove them to have been the *church* of God.

When speaking on this subject before, I quoted some texts which contained both in the Hebrew and in the Septuagint, two words, both of which signify *church*, as Dr. Mason has correctly informed you. Other passages in which the same thing occurs, I shall have to quote now. That these two synonymous nouns are connected by a simple conjunction, is accounted for, upon a principle, which is remarkable in the Hebrew, though not peculiar to that language. It is, that nouns are often attached to other nouns, to answer the purpose of adjectives and participles. (y) When, therefore, קהל *the church*, and עדת *the church*, are put together, they appear to signify *the meeting met*, or *the congregation congregated*, or *the church assembled*. Thus does Dr. Gill understand it in Prov. v. 14, where the Septuagint translates these words by εκκλησια and συναγωγη. “I was almost in all evil in the midst of *the church assembled*.” The Dr. understands this to mean, “in the house of God, attending public worship,” “even in the presence and before the people of God.” This great Baptist Commentator evidently considered this text a proof that the Old Testament worshippers were the visible church of God : for what else can he mean by calling them *the people of God, attending public worship, in the house of God*?

In the Septuagint of Levit. iv. 13, both these words

(y) “When one substantive is joined to another by a copulative, the one must be translated as governing the other.” Macknight’s fourth Preliminary Essay, Section 19. “As the Jews had but few adjectives in their language, they had recourse to substantives, in order to supply their place.” Horne’s seventh rule on the Hebraisms of the New Testament. The same examples, in part, are adduced by both.

M

are rendered συναγωγῇ. “And if the whole *עדת church* of Israel sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eyes of *קהל the church*.” On this text Dr. Gill quotes, with approbation, the following words of Ainsworth; “that *the church* may err, and “the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly, congregation, or *church*, so that they don’t know that it is a sin which they have committed.”

In Prov. xxi. 16, where the LXX has the same rendering, “the connexion of the term” shews that the word *קהל* does not mean the church of God, but “an assembly” of Unitarians or Papists, Polytheists or Atheists. “The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding, shall remain in the *congregation* of the “dead.”

In Prov. xix. 20, where the same words occur for *church*, in the Hebrew and LXX, “the connexion of “the term” shews that it means the *church* of God, excommunication from which, Gill thinks may be intended. (z)

The following five texts have *עדת* in the Hebrew, and συναγωγῇ in the LXX. “Whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the *church* of Israel.” (a) To be cut off “from “the *Israelitish church-state*, and have no communion “in it, or partake of the ordinances of it,” is one of several alternatives, which Gill thinks may be here intended. On this and the last text, the existence of the

(z) Compare his note on verse 13, to which he refers.

(a) Ex. xii. 19. Comp. 15, and Gill on the latter, to which he refers from the former.

Israelitish church is taken for granted by this preeminent scholar of the Baptist Society.

God directed Moses to have two silver trumpets made, “for the calling of the *church*, and for the journeying of the camps.”(b) On this Gill says, “Saints are pilgrims and travellers here; they are passing through a wilderness, their way is attended with many difficulties; Canaan is the place they are travelling to.”

When two and a half of the tribes of Israel built an altar before they crossed the Jordan, the rest of the church thought them apostates from the true religion, and sent a deputation to them on this subject. Gill copies our translation of the introduction of their messages, and comments upon it as follows, viz. “‘Thus saith the whole congregation of the Lord,’—By whom they were sent, and whom they represented; and they don’t call them the congregation of Israel, but of the Lord, because it was not on a civil but religious account they were come, and not to plead their own cause, but the cause of God; and not so much to shew a concern for their own honour and interest, as for the glory of God.” If they were a religious, and not a civil assembly; if they were a congregation of the Lord, and not of man; and if, (as the text proves, and Gill admits,) they acted in these respects, as a visible corporation, then they were just what you and I would call *the visible church of God*.

In the same sense ought the following instance to be understood. “Praise ye the Lord, I will praise the

“ Lord with my whole heart, in the assembly of the
 “ upright, and in the *church*.”(c)

The following authority seems to unite civil and ecclesiastical privileges, and to refer them all, not to the Sinaitic covenant made with their fathers, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, but to the older covenant made with their father Abraham, and confirmed to Isaac and Jacob. “ And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them.”(d) Gill confirms my interpretation as follows, viz. “ ‘ And because he
 “ loved thy fathers,’—Not their immediate fathers,
 “ whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, and entered not
 “ into the good land because of their unbelief, but their
 “ more remote fathers or ancestors, Abraham, Isaac, and
 “ Jacob, who had some singular testimonies of the love
 “ of God to them. Abraham is called the friend of
 “ God, and Isaac was the son of promise in whom the
 “ seed was called ; and Jacob is particularly said to be
 “ loved by God, when Esau was hated : ‘ therefore he
 “ chose their seed after them ;’ not to eternal life and
 “ salvation, but to the enjoyment of external blessings
 “ and privileges, to be called by his name, and to set up
 “ his name and worship among them, and to be a *special*
 “ *people* to him above all people on the earth, as to out-
 “ ward favours, *both civil and ecclesiastical*.” By
 denying that they were chosen, in a body, to *eternal*
life, the Dr. shews that he distinguishes them from the
invisible church ; but by saying that God had chosen
 them to be a *special people*, to have his *worship* among
 them, and to enjoy great *outward favours*, both civil

(c) Ps. cxi. 1.

(d) Deut. iv. 37.

and ECCLESIASTICAL, he shews that they are the *visible* church.

I proceed to give some instances in which the words קהל and εκκλησια are found in the Hebrew and the LXX, to point out the church. On the account which Joshua gives of his reading the law of Moses to the *church*, Dr. Gill comments as follows, viz. “There was not a
 “ word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read
 “ not before all the congregation of Israel, [who were
 “ on this occasion called together, and not before the
 “ men only, but] with the women and the little ones,”
 [who all had a concern in the things that were read to them.](e) A church of men, women, and little ones, sounds very much like Pedobaptism. In another instance, he speaks still stronger in a similar strain.(f)

In David’s address to Goliath, he says, “And all this
 “ *assembly* shall know that the Lord saveth not with the
 “ sword and spear.” Dr. Gill says that the word *assembly* means, “The congregation of Israel, and *church of*
 “ *the living God*, great part of which was now gathered
 “ together, and were spectators of this wonderful
 “ event.”(g)

David says, “I will give thee thanks in the great
church; I will praise thee among much people.” Dr. Gill explains this to mean, “the *church and people of*
 “ *God*,” “the *people of God* meeting together for
 “ solemn worship.”(h)

David again says, “let them exalt him also in the
church of the people.” Gill says,—“Of the people of

(e) Josh. viii. 35

(g) 1 Sam. xvii. 1. 7.

(f) Gill on Joel ii. 16.

(h) Ps. xxxv. 18.

“ God, who are gathered out of the world, into a *church-state*, and who gather themselves together to attend the “ worship and service of God in some one place.”(i)

It is not my intention to tax your patience so far as to quote one fourth of the instances in which the Hebrew and the Septuagint apply קהל and εκκλησια to the Jews, as the visible church of God. Out of the comparatively small number of examples which were selected for this point, from the Old Testament, I shall, at present, pass over twenty-two which are now before me.(j)

**MR. CAMPBELL'S
NEW TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,
REVIEWED,**

IN CONNEXION WITH THE POINT NOW IN HAND.

In the New Testament, *ecclesia* occurs one hundred and fourteen times; in more than one hundred of which it confessedly means the visible church. I do not know that my Opponent will confess this, but every other sort of Baptist will. My reason for excepting him is, that he has such an aversion to the word *church*, (a word inestimably precious to the Christian,) that he appears determined to banish it from his vocabulary. He has published an English translation of the New Testament, in which, (strange to tell!) neither the word *church* nor the word *baptism* is found once. By its title page, it professes to be “ The New Testament, translated from the original Greek, by “ GEORGE CAMPBELL, JAMES MACKNIGHT, and PHILIP DOD- “ DRIDGE, Doctors of the Church of Scotland.” In the Preface and the list of *errata*, he speaks of a “ London edition of this translation,” which “ departed in some instances from the origi-

(i) Ps. cvii. 32.

(j) 1 Kgs. viii. 14. 2 Chr. i. 3. 5. vi. 3. (comp. 2.) vi. 12. 13. xxix. 23. 28. 31. 32. xxx. 2. 13. 17. 23. 24. Ezr. x. 8. Neh. viii. 2. (comp. 3—8.) Ps. xxii. 22. xl. 9. lxxxix. 5. cxlix. 1. Lam. i. 10.

nal works," of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge. Such of these alterations as affected "*the style*" only, he professes to have "retained:" but "some of these alterations affected the sense;" these he professes to have "brought back to the original works" of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge. In this translation, then, we are to look for the meaning of a certain set of men, clothed in another man's style. When the Ettric Shepherd first saw Duncan Campbell, the little stranger, though only seven years old, wore a coat originally made for a man. If this new style should give George Campbell and his companions as grotesque an appearance, my Opponent can account for it, upon the ground that they are just escaped from prison, through his benevolent interposition. Here a writer in the *Western Luminary* speaks as follows; viz. "Mr. Campbell, on this part of his subject, says something about the works of Campbell, Doddridge, and Macknight having been 'imprisoned;' and seems 'to take credit to himself for having brought them out to public gaze; and considers his own precious existence necessary 'to prevent them from being again locked up.'"^(k) How enviable is the lot of my Opponent! in being the honoured instrument of preserving these eminent scholars from rotting in a dungeon. His agency in this business proves the rapid advance of the Western Country in *the march of mind*. Let posterity know, that, but for the labours of a certain inhabitant of Buffalo Creek, the works of three of the most celebrated Doctors of Europe would soon have sunk into oblivion.

As his alterations of his originals are far more numerous than one would expect from the title page, he tells us, in the close of his Appendix, that these emendations "are preferred merely "because of their being more intelligible to common readers, "whose edification we have supremely in view." For these alterations he has made ample amends to the admirers of his three worthies, by stuffing their jugulated words into an Appendix, with such novel and convenient references, that they are

(k) *Western Lum.* for Jan. 3, 1827.

almost as easily found as a needle in a hay-stack. Speaking of this in his preface, he says, "All that we can be praised or "blamed for is this one circumstance, that we have given the "most conspicuous place, to that version which appeared to "deserve it." That is, when the words of Campbell, Mac-knight, and Doddridge appear to my Opponent the most deserving, he gives them in the text, and places others in the Appendix: but when the words of these three men appear to my Opponent less deserving, he packs them off to the Appendix, and substitutes others in the translation, whose names are not mentioned in the title page. Thus every word of this version may be considered as having passed through the crucible of my Opponent's judgment. And who so well calculated to judge among the jarring translations of jarring sects, as that man who possesses the greatest literary and theological attainments, and is, at the same time, perfectly divested of all sectarian feelings or prejudices, as is evident from the whole career of my Opponent, from Mount Pleasant to Washington. Hear the words of his Preface on this subject. "If the mere publication of a version of the "inspired writings requires, as we believe it does, the publisher "to have no sectarian object in view, we are happy in being "able to appeal to our whole course of public addresses, and to "all that we have written on religious subjects, to shew that we "have no such object in view!!!" Perhaps so great a portion of charity, anti-sectarian liberality, and the milk of human kindness, can hardly be found in the island of Great Britain, as my Opponent knows to exist in one little privileged spot on the banks of Buffaloe. It is reasonable, therefore, that he should claim to his work superior praise, over the London copy, whose Editors probably spent much of their strength in sectarian debates against infant-sprinkling, and the thirty-nine articles, and the thirty-three Chapters, and male and female Missionaries, and Bible and Benevolent Societies, and the observance of family prayer, and the sabbath day. As my Opponent never was known to whisper sectarian charges against other denominations, for holding doctrines or ordinances "injurious to the well-

being of society, religious or political," he must be indulged in a little commendable boasting, such as the following, viz. "Taking every thing into view, we have no hesitation in saying, that, in the present improved state of the English language, the ideas communicated by the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, are *INCOMPARABLY* better expressed in this, than in any volume ever presented in our mother tongue."(*l*) Whenever, therefore, my Opponent's Translation of the New Testament is mentioned in this discussion, remember, that, "taking every thing into view," particularly his own rare qualifications for such a work, it is "*INCOMPARABLY*" the best in the language.

To set forth his unparalleled qualifications still more fully, he says, in his Preface, "The whole scope, design, and drift of our labours is to see Christians intelligent, *united* and happy." With regard to uniting Christians, his labours, in one way or another, appear to succeed in a small degree. The Western Luminary, (*m*) informs us that my Opponent has made an ingenious effort to prove that his two bosom friends, a Unitarian,* and Dr. James Fishback, are *united* in sentiment, in relation to our Saviour's person, although the former openly rejects the doctrine of his supreme and eternal Deity, and the latter would be thought to receive this doctrine. Moreover, they are now very cordially *united* in their opposition to creeds and confessions, those stubborn things which have been so much in the way of Unitarians, from the Council of Nice to the present day. If Mr. Greatrake and the Orthodox Pastors and Editors, Associations and Conventions of the Baptist denomination have not followed the amiable example of *unity* which these brethren have set them, it is their own fault. Mr. Greatrake will not admit that my Opponent is for peace abroad or *unity* at home. Writing to the Western Baptist Churches concerning my Opponent, he says, "Having had you for two or three years spectators of his

(*l*) Introduction to Appendix.

(*m*) For Jan. 3, 1827.

* The writer, through mistake, gave a wrong name to the Unitarian, as he afterwards informed me.

“ own personal combats, or familiarized your minds to a view
 “ of his own fightings, you will find, perhaps too late, that the
 “ object contemplated by Mr. C. was to prepare you for dissen-
 “ tions and fightings among yourselves; to the end that he
 “ might share the spoils by making you a divided people.”⁽ⁿ⁾
 As my Opponent refers to his life for his antisectarian charac-
 ter, so Mr. Greatrake says to the churches, “ Yes, brethren,
 search, search his whole life, as far as possible.” He then tells
 them that this scrutiny will irrefragably prove “ that you [Bap-
 “ tists,] as a denomination, have been made the citadel of his safe-
 “ ty, while throwing the shafts of his hostility at other denomina-
 “ tions; particularly at that one with which you most assuredly
 “ stand in the greatest degree of fellowship. The question
 “ then is, whether Mr. C. represents *your feelings* towards
 “ the Presbyterian and other Pedobaptist churches, against
 “ whom he ‘ breathes out threatenings and slaughter?’ If he
 “ does, let us know what cause they have given for this inter-
 “ minable rage. But I need not put this sort of question to you,
 “ being fully persuaded that your greatest partiality is towards
 “ that very church which Mr. C. appears to hate with the most
 “ deadly hatred.”^(o) This is a righteous sentence pronounced
 in the name of the Western Baptist Churches, by one of their
 most respectable and worthy ministers, in exculpation of the
 much injured, and grossly insulted Pedobaptists of this country.
 It correctly represents my would-be antisectarian Opponent, as
breathing threatenings and slaughter, and throwing the shafts of
his hostility with interminable rage, and the most deadly hatred,
at other denominations, particularly our own; and as doing this,
 not to oppose error, (for he is rotten to the core,) but all this
 zeal against others is, that he may prepare the Baptists for *dis-*
sensions and fightings among themselves, that he may share the
 spoils of their divisions. He must surely be rarely qualified for
 writing an *incomparable* translation of the New Testament!

One prominent feature of this anomalous production is, that

(n) Unitarian Baptist of the Robinson School Exposed, p. 88.

(o) Do. p. 87.

it professes to reject every adopted or anglicised word. Dr. George Campbell's labours in favour of immersion give him some aid in this particular. Complaining of our Translators, the Dr. says, "some words they have transferred from the original into their language, others they have translated." He wishes that they had not *transcribed* the word *baptism*, but given it a dipping translation. He considers *baptism*, even now, "a foreign name. "For this reason," says he, "I should think the word *immersion* (which, though of Latin origin, is an English noun, regularly formed from the verb *to immerse*,) a better English name than *baptism*, were we now at liberty to make a choice." (p)

When great men sicken into a prurient longing to carry some wrong point, what weak arguments they will sometimes use! Now I would inquire of the literary world, if it be not as true, that BAPTISM, *though of Greek origin, is an English noun, regularly formed from the verb TO BAPTIZE*, as that immersion, "though of Latin origin, is an English noun, regularly formed from the verb *to immerse*?" Both these words were originally foreign, and both are now naturalized; and if there be any difference, it is in favour of *baptism*, because this, being more generally known and understood, is more completely domesticated. Besides, the connexion of the term, in the scriptures, shews that *immersion* would be a perversion, instead of a translation, of the Original. It was evidently this consideration which sometimes made Dr. Macknight follow our Bible in transcribing. He does not say "All were *immersed* into Moses in the cloud and in the sea," as my Opponent's *incomparable* has said for him; but he says "all were *baptized* into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." When a man's zeal against the adoption of Greek words, leads him not only to publish Dr. Campbell's weak argument, but to invent a fact for Paul, and forge a translation for Macknight, I am ready to say in reference to a reproof once given to an incompetent imitator of Pindar, "Dr. Campbell was bold, but thou art impudent."

(t) See Appendix to the incomparable. No. 4.

Scores of alterations, where this word is concerned, are confessed in the Appendix; and after he was taxed with the fault he shews that they were promised in the Prospectus, which, however, is not published with the work, and is in direct opposition to the promise contained in the title-page. His prospectus reads as follows, viz. “There is also one improvement of considerable importance which ought to be made in this work, and to which we shall attend. Sundry terms are not translated into English, but adopted into those translations from long usage. Those terms are occasionally translated into English by Campbell and Macknight; but not always. We shall uniformly give them the meaning which they have affixed to them, wherever they occur, and thus make this a pure English New Testament, not mingled with Greek words, either adopted or anglicised.”(q) Here is a promise that he will make his translation such pure English, that it shall not contain any adopted words, such as *Martyr*, *Archangel*, *Myriad*, *Mystery*, *Schism*, *Blasphemy*, *Denarius*, *Euroclydon*, *Tartarus*, *Abyss*, *Hades*. Some of these words, such as *myriad*, *denarius*, *tartarus*, *abyss*, and *hades*, are translated and not adopted in our bible: but his translation is greatly to excel ours in this respect, and be much purer English. He promises to adopt none, but translate all. After this, would you expect to hear me say that he had actually adopted the whole of them, even those which our bible translates? Yet such is the fact!

In one case, he copies Doddridge, concerning “the *martyrs* of Jesus,”(r) though in another he alters Doddridge’s *martyr* into *witness*.(s) *Angel* is a Greek word anglicised; he therefore rejects it utterly, and always uses the word *Messenger* for it. *Archangel* also is a Greek word transcribed, and might just as properly be rendered *Prime-messenger*: yet this word he uniformly adopts.(t) *Myriad* is a Greek word anglicised, and

(q) See it quoted in West. Luminary for Jan. 3, 1827.

(r) Rev. xvii. 6.

(s) Rev. ii. 13.

(t) In 1 Thess. iv. 16. Jude ix. the only places in which it occurs in the N. T.

when used in connexion with angels, is rendered by Macknight "ten thousands of angels." (u) My Opponent's *incomparable* alters this into "*myriads* of messengers." How wonderfully this elucidates the subject! But in the Appendix he tells us that such improvements are made, that the scriptures may be "more intelligible to common readers, whose edification," says he, "we have supremely in view." Some common readers, however, are so stupid that they would think this improvement worth very little more than a pair of leather spectacles. Besides copying Doddridge in transferring the word *mystery*, (v) and Macknight in transferring the word *schism*, (w) he holds fast to this adopted word twice, even where Macknight translates it; (x) in one of which instances he justifies himself by the authority of Dr. George Campbell, who first taught him to condemn such transcriptions. (y) The Dr. and his *incomparable* disciple sometimes translate *blasphemy* and *blaspheme*, though poorly enough; yet at other times both the noun and the verb are adopted by them. (z) As for *denarius*, I believe they uniformly transfer it; (a) although our American *dime* is a coin of the same value, and would, (in our country at least,) afford a good translation. He has adopted *Euroclydon*, (b) although he knows that *Levanter* is a translation familiar to the commercial world. To be more intelligible to common readers, he has adopted *tartarus*, (c) instead of translating it *hell* as our bible does. In one instance now before me, (d) he follows Dr. Campbell in transferring the word *abyss*, where our bible translates it *the deep*, notwithstanding their censures against it for transferring instead of translating. In other cases he copies Doddridge's *abyss*; (e) besides which he translates it *the deep* with Macknight, (f) and *the bottomless pit*, with Doddridge. (g) In relation to another word of similar import, my Opponent says, "There being no one word

(u) Hebr. xii. 22.

(v) Rev. xvii. 5.

(w) 1 Cor. xii. 25.

(x) 1 Cor. xi. 18. i. 10. (y) 1 Cor. i. 10. and Appendix, No. 67.

(z) In Matt. xxvi. 65, both occur.

(a) I have examined them in Matt. xviii. 28. xx. 2. 9. 10. 13. xxii. 19.

(b) Acts xxvii. 14.

(c) 1 Pet. ii. 4.

(d) Luke viii. 31.

(e) Rev. xi. 7. xx. 3.

(f) Rom. x. 7.

(g) Rev. ix. 11. xvii. 18. xx. 1.

in our language which corresponds to the term *hades*, he [Dr. George Campbell] is obliged to retain and explain it." He at the same time says, "We [Mr. Alexander Campbell] have uniformly followed his method in the books which he did not translate."(*h*) That is, the word *hades* is never translated, but always retained in his New Testament. This he does in despite of Mac-knight's *grave*,(*i*) and Doddridge's *hell*,(*j*) and his *unseen world*(*k*) yet in this last translation my Opponent actually copies Doddridge in three places,(*l*) notwithstanding his promise uniformly to retain *hades* after Dr. Campbell's example. From these instances we may conclude that when he promises to adopt, he will be sure to translate, and when he abuses our Translators for adopting, he means to adopt twice as much as they have done.

As my Opponent promised always to *translate*, so his *incomparable* makes extraordinary pretensions to uniformity in its translations. His three guides have rendered the same word sometimes one way and sometimes another. This he seems determined to avoid as an error. He says "Wherever the word *church* is found in the common version, *congregation* will be found in this. We shall let Drs. Campbell and Doddridge defend the preference. For although they have not always so rendered it, they give the best of reasons why it should be *always* so translated."(*m*) Here the arguments of Doddridge and Campbell are given for a uniformity which they did not approve nor practise. But on this subject my Opponent is a professed disciple of Horne Tooke, who was a great enemy to allowing a diversity of significations to the same word. After informing you that Dr. Johnson assigned forty-six meanings to an English monosyllable, he says, "But the celebrated Horne Tooke demonstrates that it has but one meaning, and that all the pretended meanings of Dr. S. Johnson are resolvable into it."(*n*) He then goes on to apply the remark to the

(*h*) Appendix No 21.

(*i*) 1 Cor. xv. 55.

(*j*) Rev. vi. 8.

(*k*) Rev. xx. 13. 14.

(*l*) Acts ii. 27. 31. Rev. i. 18.

(*m*) Appendix No. 10.

(*n*) Spurious Debate with W. L. M. p. 313. Note.

Greek prepositions in opposition to Parkhurst, who allowed sixteen meanings to one, and eighteen to another. Let it be remembered that Horne Tooke, in ascertaining his one meaning of a word, is governed by its etymology. Here also my Opponent follows him; and he gives this as a reason for banishing the word *church* from his New Testament. He says, "The term *church* or *kirk*, is an abbreviation of the word *κκλησιον* " *οικος the house of the Lord*, and does not translate the term " *εκκλησια*," [a calling out.](o) Here the mere fact of two words being differently derived, is given as a reason why they cannot have the same signification, and why one of them cannot properly translate the other. If *church* cannot render *ecclesia*, merely because it is etymologically *the house of the Lord*, and not *a calling out*, then surely his favourite *congregation* cannot render it, for this is, by derivation, *a gathering together*, and not *a calling out*. This places *ecclesia* in the same predicament in which he says that *hades* is, without a corresponding word in our language. To be consistent, then, he should either transcribe it, or form some new word, like *evocation*, of a similar derivation. So completely has my Opponent entangled himself by this position, that if it can be maintained, then he has destroyed his whole new version. If the mere want of coincidence in etymology is sufficient to disqualify *church* from rendering *ecclesia*, then his *incomparable* has not translated one verse of the New Testament correctly. If he were tried by his own test, he would fall infinitely below our own translators. This he knows very well, and, therefore, in direct defiance of his own principles, he condemns them for paying too much attention to the literal and etymological meaning of words. He says, "The kings translators have frequently erred in attempting to be, what some would call literally correct. They have not given the meaning in some passages where they have given a literal translation." More directly still to the point, he says, "that what a classical scholar, or a critical *etymologist* [such as

“Horne Tooke or his disciple] might approve, as a literal
 “version of some passages, is by no means the meaning of the
 “writer.” These sentiments, he informs us, are the fruit of
 his “better acquaintance with the idiomatic style of the Apostolic
 “writings, and of the Septuagint Greek;” while he stigmatizes
 as “smatterers in the original Greek,”(*p*) those who lean to the
 closer and stricter rendering of our Translators. He would
 have come nearer the truth if he had told you that instead of
 obtaining these sentiments from his own better acquaintance
 with the Greek Scriptures, he took them, second-handed, from
 Dr. George Campbell, who published them, as an apology for his
 extremely loose version of the four Gospels, which might more
 correctly be called a paraphrase than a translation. In avoiding
 the *literal* extreme of Arias Montanus, he went so com-
 pletely into the *liberal* extreme, that he saw himself in danger
 of being accused of *licentiousness*. In relation to my Opponent’s
 views of the words *ecclesia* and *church*, on account of their want
 of etymological coincidence, permit me to give you a little more
 from Dr. Campbell. In shewing how unsafe it sometimes is to
 trust to the etymology of a word for its meaning, he says,
 “There are many cases wherein, though its descent may be
 “clearly traced, we should err egregiously, if we were to fix
 “its meaning from that of the primitive or root.” “Thus the
 “three words *καμικος* in Greek, *paganus* in Latin, and *villain*
 “in English, though evidently so conformable in etymology, that
 “they ought all to denote the same thing, namely *villager*; have,
 “for many ages, both lost that signification, and acquired others
 “in which they do not in the least resemble one another. If
 “the use in these languages should ever come to be very little
 “known, and the history of the nations nearly lost, we may
 “form a guess at the absurdities in explaining those terms, into
 “which men would be misled by etymology.”(*q*) Doubtless my
 Opponent will agree to all this when Dr. Campbell says it, just
 as he agrees to the very opposite when Horne Tooke says it.

(*p*) Preface, p. 7.

(*q*) Dr. Campbell’s fourth Preliminary Dissertation. Sections 16. 17.

When he sells himself to two masters, he is for yielding implicit obedience to both, even when they are diametrically opposed to each other, and lead him into palpable contradictions and absurdities.

The absurdity of his preferring *congregation* to *church*, as a rendering of *ecclesia*, and then uniformly adhering to that rendering, will soon be evident. The word *ecclesia* is used to denote the place of worship as well as the worshipping assembly. The word *church* has the same latitude of signification: but *congregation* has not. Paul says, "When ye come together in the *ecclesia*, I hear that there be divisions among you."^(r) Our Bible says, "when ye come together in the *church*." Of this Dr. Gill approves, and says that the word means "the *place* where the *church* met together to perform divine service," which exposition he proves by the context. Accordingly Dr. Mac-knight says, "when ye come together in the *church*." As usual, my Opponent alters the word *church*, and says, "When ye come together in the *congregation*."

In another instance, according to Doddridge, "The Sadducees say, there is no resurrection, neither *angel* nor spirit."^(s) My Opponent's incomparable reads, "There is no resurrection, neither [good nor evil] *messenger*," &c. What Doddridge calls *angel* in the next verse, my Opponent calls "heavenly *messenger*," without enclosing the word heavenly in brackets, as he did the words "good and evil" in the former verse. This way of translating leaves the common reader, (whose benefit my Opponent had supremely in view,) perfectly at a loss to know what is in Doddridge, what is in the Original, and what the new translator would be at.

Another instance of the astonishing uniformity of my Opponent's New Testament. There are four texts in which Doddridge, with some claims to uniformity, transfers the word *mystery*.^(t) In the first of these my Opponent agrees with him

(r) 1 Cor. xi. 18.

(t) Rev. xvii. 5. 7. (com. 22) x. 7. i. 20.

(s) Acts xxiii. 8.

in transferring. In the second and third, he translates it *secret*. In the fourth he renders it *hidden-meaning*.

Again; there are six texts in which Doddridge uniformly transcribes the words *blaspheme*, *blasphemer*, *blasphemy*, *blasphemously*.(u) Only four of these are in those books of which he professes to give Doddridge's translation. In the first of these, my Opponent transcribes *blasphemers* as Doddridge does. In the second he translates *detractions*, in the third, *abusive things*, in the fourth *reviled*, in the fifth *slander*, and in the sixth *defamation*. All this is for the sake of an extraordinary and scrupulous uniformity!

Once more. The word *anastasis* occurs four times in the compass of eight verses.(v) In the first of these instances, my Opponent's *incomparable* uniformity renders it *future life*, in the second *resurrection*, in the third *that state*, and in the fourth *revival*, where Dr. Campbell has it *quickening*. Now in all these places, our translation, which is so much censured for its want of uniformity, uses the word *resurrection*, as Doddridge does. With this uniform rendering agree the Latin translations of Jerome, Castalio, Beza, and that of Junius and Tremellius: as do also the German, Italian, and French, of Luther, Diodati, and De Sacy, with a variety of others in different languages. Even the Unitarian Improved Version, and the Universalist double-distilled version by Mr. Kneeland, renders the word uniformly *resurrection* as our bible does. My Opponent's superfine is the only one which professes an unparalleled consistency, and he and his pattern, whom he has altered, are the only ones who have given four renderings to this word, in a passage of eight verses.

Let it be remembered that my Opponent does not openly offer to the public a new version of his own, but he proposes to give us the works of Drs. Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge. In his Appendix he says, "we were scrupulously intent on giving

(u) Acts xix. 37. Mk. iii. 28. Luke xxii. 65. Acts xviii. 6. Rev. ii. 9. xiii. 6.

(v) Matt. xxii. 23. 28. 30. 31.

“every word of the works proposed.”(w) It is true that in making this declaration, he may have had his eye upon the notes, in which, however, he has not given every word of the works proposed, as may be seen in the alteration last mentioned, and others without number. But if he had scrupulously given every word of theirs in the notes, would that justify him in imposing the work upon the community, as the “New Testament translated from the original Greek, by George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge, Doctors of the Church of Scotland?” He ought rather to have called it, the translation of one man, accompanied with the various readings of three others: or, at least, he should have given it such an honest title as that of the Unitarian translation; “The New Testament, in an Improved Version, upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome’s new translation, with a corrected text, and notes critical and explanatory.” The authors of this work did not dare to offer it to the British public, as “the New Testament translated by Newcome, a Primate of the Church of England,” but only a new version “upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome’s.” What then would they think of a Unitarian Baptist, who would publish a translation, purporting to be the work of three “Doctors of the Church of Scotland,” and yet containing more variations from these Doctors, by three or four, if not ten times, than the Improved Version has alterations of Newcome’s translation? Mr. Kneeland’s New Testament is as good a copy of either Scarlett or the Improved Version, as my Opponent’s is of the three Doctors: yet he had not the audacity to palm it upon the public as either of these works, but was satisfied with the puerile vanity of being the author of a new version, between which and its models there was no important difference.

In some important instances, my Opponent agrees with these corrupt versions, in opposition to those which he promised to copy. It is well known that the Unitarians endeavour to fitter down the interview between Paul and the jailer to little more

than a consultation about temporal safety from civil punishment by the Roman government. This has been attempted I am told, by Dr. Holley in Lexington. With a view to this, the Unitarian Improved Version makes the jailer say, "Sirs, what must I do to be *safe*?" And it makes Paul and Silas answer, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be *safe* and thine household."(*x*) To the word *safe*, they append a note informing us that Newcome has the word *saved* in accordance with our translation: after which the note says "Mr. Wakefield explains it, to avoid punishment for what has befallen the prisoners and the prison. "This," he adds, "is beyond all doubt, the sense of the passage; though Paul, in his reply, uses the words in a more extensive signification: a practice common in these writings." Kneeland copies the translation and the note without giving credit for either. My Opponent translates, "O Sirs, what must I do that I may be *safe*? And they said, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be *safe*, and thine house." As there is nothing about this passage in the margin, and as there is no note referring from this or any other part of the chapter to the Appendix, any reader, who has not been accustomed to catching eels, would take it for granted that Doddridge had given the above translation in accordance with the Unitarian and Universalist versions. But on examining the Appendix, half of Doddridge's translation is found wedged in between notes to which reference is made from the preceding and succeeding chapters. In connexion with this half-reading, he gives the reason why he had thus hidden Doddridge, and "given the most conspicuous place to that [Unitarian] version, which appeared to deserve it." This reason is given in the words of Wakefield the Unitarian, as follows, viz. "The jailer meant no more than, what shall I do to be safe from punishment? for what had befallen the prisoners and the prison? This is, beyond doubt the sense of the passage; though Paul, in his reply, uses the words in a more extensive signification; a practice common in

“these writings.” These words in the Appendix are preceded and followed by the name of Wakefield, as the author of the translation and note. Thus, while there is a happy agreement between Doddridge and our translation, there is also a sweet harmony between the Socinian version of London, the Universalist of Philadelphia, and the Arian Baptist of Buffaloe Creek.

It is well known that the exhortation of Paul “to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood,”^(y) is shocking to the feelings of those who do not believe in the supreme deity and true humanity of him whose blood has satisfied divine justice for the sins of his people. It even wounds weak Christians, on account of its appearing to attribute blood and suffering to God who is impassible. For this reason various transcribers and translators, ancient and modern, have softened down the Apostle’s expression, by substituting, some, one word, and, some another, which may not be so shocking to their feelings. Some of these transcribers and translators are adduced by the Unitarian Improved Version, to prove that the word *Lord* is a better reading than that of the received text. Mr. Kneeland’s Universalist Version also prefers the word *Lord*; and so does my Opponent’s edition of Dr. Doddridge’s translation, without one marginal note or reference to the Appendix from any part of the Chapter to shew that he was not reporting the Dr. correctly. On this account, “A Friend to Truth” in “The Western Luminary,”^(z) in noticing this alteration, says that my Opponent “passes over it silently.” This mistake was owing to the violation of a promise made by my Opponent in his Preface. His words are these, viz. “instead of crowding the “margin with different translations and critical notes, we have “placed them in an Appendix and made references to them at “the bottom of the page.”^(a) After having generally disregarded this engagement until he gets to the 224th page of his translation, he then refers to a note in the Appendix, which gives notice that he will violate this promise on a greater

(y) Acts xx. 28.

(z) For Jan. iii. 1827.

(a) p. 10.

scale "in the subsequent books of the New Testament, than in the preceding," and assigns as a reason for this course, that so many references "at the bottom of the page" "would rather have disfigured the page." I confess that if his work were bespangled with asterisks and other marks as numerous as the instances in which he has altered his three great men, it would give his page some resemblance to whortle berries and milk: but the right way to remedy this evil, is not to conceal the alterations, but to remove them, by giving a fair copy of his Doctors. At present, however, he saves his page at the expense of his veracity and honesty. Instead of making his notes plain for common readers, and opening them by distinct references, he makes them short, contracted, and to most men, unintelligible; and then wraps up a great number of them in a bundle, not with the order of a pedlar's pack, but with the confusion of a rag-man's sack. With the exception of one little note of less than a line, all my Opponent's notes on eight chapters now before me, are squeezed into one of these bales, to which there is only one reference in the whole translation. Snugly enclosed in the centre of this astonishing hurra's nest, you find the following note, viz. "v. 29. 'Church of God;' Dod. 'Of the Lord;' Griesbach." This I perceive to be a note on the 29th verse of something. Going very little farther back, I find "Chap. xx." This therefore must be the 29th verse of the 20th Chapter of some book. Anxious to find the name of the book, I in vain explore this branch of notes to its source. Being disappointed here, I examine the batch of notes preceding it, and the one preceding that, until I have tried as many as you have fingers and toes, without being able to discover the name of the book to which one note belongs. Here he will say that this defect in the notes is supplied by the "references to them at the bottom of the page," where the text is found in the translation. This would have been the case in some measure, if he had performed his promise in making those references at the bottom of the page. But the text to which this note belongs, is on page 266. Here there is no reference, nor on any preceding page nearer than

259, where another verse of another chapter gives occasion to refer to this mass of notes, seven pages before the text in question, and thirteen pages before the last text contained in the mass. After a tedious search you can discover that his “v. 29,” means not the 29th, but the 28th verse of the 20th Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles; and that his “‘Church of God;’ Dod. ‘Of the Lord;’ Griesbach,” means that Doddridge agrees with our bible in giving the name of *God* to him who purchased the church with his blood, whereas my Opponent had rejected Doddridge, and followed Griesbach, in substituting the word *Lord*. In answer to his detector in the Western Luminary (*b*) he defends this substitution by observing, “I said in the preface I “gave the most conspicuous place to that reading or rendering “which I thought deserved it—and so it happens here.” Yes, let it be remembered that he puts into the text of this new translation, whatever he thinks deserves it, and then publishes this compilation of a Unitarian Baptist, as the work of three Presbyterian Pedobaptist Doctors!!!

As my Opponent in connexion with the above remark, gave his reason at large, for supplanting Doddridge with another reading, indulge me with the liberty of paying a moment’s attention to them. They are three. One is that Griesbach “decides in favour of the latter.” Another is that Ireneus “quotes it as in the new translation.” A third is that “The Syriac translation, the oldest in the world, has it *Lord*.”

The two last reasons are alledged facts which he observes, “I [Mr. Campbell] added in my own mind to the authority of Griesbach.” Thus my Opponent, with all his professed opposition to creeds and confessions of human composition, is not yet escaped from human authority. In favour of a Unitarian translation of Acts xvi. 30, he gives no other authority than that of Wakefield, a Unitarian writer: and in favour of a Unitarian reading of Acts xx. 28, he gives “the authority of Griesbach,” whom the Unitarians claim. Real Christians call no man

Father; and they adopt a human creed, as they would preach or hear a human sermon; because they believe it to be founded upon the scriptures. But many unregenerate persons receive this creed, as my Opponent once did the Westminster Confession, upon no other ground than human authority; and they afterwards reject it, as my Opponent has done, because they prefer a Unitarian Master to any other. Here also it may not be improper to observe, as the writer in the Western Luminary has done, that the celebrated Nolan has proved that the *criteria* by which Griesbach has made his decision, are fundamentally erroneous, and Wakefield himself has decided against him in this instance.

In answer to my Opponent's second reason, drawn from the testimony of one of the Fathers, in favour of his reading, I would observe that Middleton, who is not decided in favour of our reading of the passage, still says that "it is quoted or referred to by a *great many* of the Fathers."

My Opponent's third reason exhibits, if I mistake not, a greater degree of moderation than he is accustomed to. He only says that "The Syriac translation, the oldest in the world, has it *Lord*." Considering the liberties which he usually takes, we should expect him to claim the Latin Vulgate, which is the next oldest in the world; and the Arabic and Ethiopic which are highly esteemed by some. Griesbach, my Opponent's Master, actually did claim the Ethiopic; in consequence of which his professed brother Wakefield declared his testimony on this point, "*infamously false*." (c) Yet it is not more false than the testimony of a certain translator, in claiming the Syriac Version in favour of his reading. The Syriac Version has neither his reading nor ours, (d) but a reading which is found in no Manuscript, and which both parties consider unsupported by evidence. But my Opponent, no doubt, thinks that he has as good a right to alter ancient translations as modern ones; and in this I agree with him.

(c) Middleton on the text.

(d) But Messiah or Christ.

Before I dismiss this *incomparable* of my Opponent, permit me to notice his last refuge from that infamy to which the voice of an insulted and defrauded people will consign him. When his Prospectus says that he will translate such words as the three Doctors had adopted, he adds, "*But in doing this* [that is, "in translating,] *we shall not depart in any instance from the meaning which they have declared those words to convey.*" In answering his newspaper antagonist, the "Friend of Truth," he refers to this as a "promise of great importance," and adds, "Now it can be proven in any court of law or equity where the English language is spoken, that I have not, in one instance, departed from this promise. I challenge all the colleges and divines on this continent, to shew that I have not, in every instance, so done. Let this Doctor of divinity, this 'Friend to Truth' make an attempt."

This pompous challenge would make some take it for granted that my Opponent never alters the meaning of either of his Doctors, although he may alter his words. But if this be the case, why does he, according to his Preface,^(e) substitute the words of Dr. Campbell for those of Doddridge or Macknight, in every passage which he has translated? and why does he give as a reason for this, the superior "*correctness and elegance*" of his translations? Is there no difference of meaning between Dr. Campbell's correct and elegant translations, and those for which they are substituted? But correct and elegant as Dr. Campbell is, he is not to compare with my Opponent, to whose translations, those of Dr. Campbell as well as Macknight and Doddridge must give way, in order to form a book concerning which it may be said, that "the ideas communicated by the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, are incomparably better expressed in this than in any volume ever presented in our mother tongue." Can this much altered translation be incomparably better than its models, as published by themselves, or in the London Edition, without any change in the meaning of

(e) p. 10.

one word? If there be no difference in meaning, how comes it to pass that when he substitutes *hades* for Doddridge's *hell*, he gives as a reason that the word "is very improperly translated *hell*?" (f) Is there no difference between the original and a very improper translation? Taking the Epistle to the Hebrews as a specimen of the whole work, he says, in his answer to the "Friend of Truth," "About *fifty* times you will find Mac-knight in the Appendix in this one Epistle," and then offers a guess that there are as many as three thousand such alterations in the whole work, instead of the reduced calculation of fifteen hundred which his Antagonist had made. Are we to understand that he has altered the words of his authors fifty times in one Epistle, and three thousand times in all, without once changing their meaning?

But the letter of his challenge calls for an instance in which his New Testament gives a meaning different from his Doctors, by translating a word which they had adopted. The word *heresy* is translated by my Opponent, and adopted by his author. Doddridge says, "After the way which they call *heresy*, so do I worship the God of my Fathers." My Opponent says, "After the way which they call *a sect*, so worship I the God of my fathers." Now if it can be shewn that my Opponent understands the word *sect* in an indifferent sense, and that Doddridge understands the word *heresy* in an evil sense, then my Opponent has altered his author's meaning by translating a word which his author had adopted. In a note to which my Opponent refers from this text, his meaning is conveyed to us in the language of Dr. Campbell. After explaining the original by *class*, *party*, *sect*, he observes, "The word was not, in its earliest acceptation, conceived to convey any reproach in it, since it was *indifferently* used, either of a party approved, or of one disapproved by the writer." Thus my Opponent's word *sect* is understood *indifferently*. Now although Doddridge gives the word *sect* in his paraphrase, he gives a reason for preferring the

word *heresy* in the text. He admits that on account of the circumstances of the primitive Christians, "they might properly be called a *sect* or *party* of men," but he says, "I cannot but think " this a place, where the word *ἀιρεσις*, which I own to be *often* " *indifferent*, is used in a *bad sense*; for Paul plainly intimates, " that Christianity did not deserve the name they gave it." Thus my Opponent's translation gives a word in an *indifferent* sense, which Doddridge thinks might properly be applied to Christians instead of his author's adoption of a word in an *evil sense*, which Doddridge thinks the Christians did not deserve. Yet my Opponent's promise says, "We shall not depart in any " instance from the meaning which they have declared those " words to convey."

Paul once preached Christ to the Jews. My Opponent says, " But when they set themselves in opposition, and reviled, he shook his garments." (g) Would not any common reader understand from this, that the Jews reviled Paul? and was not this what my Opponent meant that they should understand? Yet Doddridge says, " they set themselves in opposition, and **BLASPHEMED**" *that glorious name on which he was pressing them to fix their dependence.* To the same amount, in other places, (h) Doddridge adopts *blasphemy*, and my Opponent translates *slander, defamation*. It is well known that in common language, *reviling, slander, and defamation*, denote an offence against our fellow men; whereas Dr. Allison, a Baptist Preacher, in his English Dictionary, says that "*blasphemy* is an offering of some " indignity unto God himself." In accordance with this, Doddridge in describing the Roman Beast, says that it was " full of *blasphemous* names." (i) which his paraphrase explains by its " ascribing to itself, and the harlot upon it, properties and glories which belong to God alone." My Opponent, instead of "*blasphemous* names," translates "*slandorous* names."

My Opponent might here urge in extenuation, that he was following his perfectly correct and elegant pattern, Dr. George

(g) Acts xviii. 6.

(h) Rev. ii. 9. 13. 1.

(i) Rev. xvii. 3.

Campbell, as he promised in his preface. If this were true, it would only shew that he made two promises which were inconsistent with each other: one is that he would always substitute Campbell's words for those of the other two Doctors; and the other is that he would never depart from their meaning. But if I mistake not, while Campbell justifies him in one departure from Doddridge(*j*) his principles and practice condemn him in all the rest. He admits that the word *blaspheme* should be retained when God is the object of this offence. In the last text the Beast is said to be full of blasphemous names, because he claims divine attributes and honors. For this very thing the Jews repeatedly accused our Saviour of the same offence; and in no such case does either Dr. Campbell or my Opponent render it *reviling*, *slander*, or *defamation*, but they both retain the word *blasphemy*. "Who is this that speaketh *blasphemies*? Can any one forgive sins beside God?" "For a good work we do not stone thee, but for *blasphemy*, because thou, being [*a*] man, makest thyself God."*(k)* In these texts my Opponent has exactly followed his model, except in the insertion of our indefinite article before the word *man*, which, among three thousand alterations, can hardly be noticed.

According to my Opponent's translation, Paul's reason for delivering Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan, was "that they might be taught by chastisement, not to *defame*." Although Macknight, whom he here professes to copy, uses the word *revile* in his commentary, yet as he expressly declares "Christ or his doctrine" to be the object of this reviling, he retains *blaspheme* in the text, according to the principles of my Opponent's favourite, Dr. Campbell: "that they might be taught by chastisement not to *blaspheme*."*(l)* In another instance (*m*) he retains *blasphemers*, where my Opponent substitutes *defamers*, although Macknight's commentary explains it "*blasphemers* of God, by the injurious representations which they give of him." I cannot tell how

(*j*) Acts xviii. 6. See his Prelim. Dissert. 9. Part 2. Sect. 12.

(*k*) Luke v. 21. John x. 33. (*l*) 1 Tim. i. 20. (*m*) 2 Tim. iii. 2.

many cases of this sort his book contains; but I have very little doubt that one whose time and patience would permit him to wade through this mass of perversion, would discover many other instances, in addition to the seven which I have pointed out, in which my Opponent's authors adopt a word with one meaning, and my Opponent translates it with another meaning: yet the promise of his Prospectus is, "But in doing this, we shall not depart in any instance, from the meaning which they have declared those words to convey." And after the work was published, he *challenges* "all the colleges and divines on this continent to shew" that he has "in one instance, departed from this promise."

My Opponent may be called a *challenge-monger*. The Reformers used to challenge that they might debate: my Opponent debates that he may challenge. A Reformer once contended ten days upon the ground of one challenge: my Opponent does not stop at ten challenges in one day, and sometimes in one speech. When used as a manœuvre, it sometimes appears *ingenious*, although it may be *disingenuous*. If a man accuse him of Unitarianism, he challenges him to prove him a Socinian, as if Unitarianism did not embrace his darling Arianism, as well as his brother Holley's Socinianism. A. accuses B. of stealing one of his *cattle*. B. challenges A. and all the colleges and lawyers on the continent to prove that he has stolen a *cow*; thinking thereby to conceal the fact that he had stolen a *calf*. But in the present case his right hand appears to have lost its cunning: for he challenges the continent to shew one instance in which he has departed from a promise, which he has directly violated in the seven specified cases, and we know not how many more.

There was a time when I thought the Unitarian Improved Version a *non-pareil* in theological atrocity: but, in respect of fraud and falsehood, this Arian Baptist's New Translation is *incomparably* beyond it. I am not sorry, therefore, that the word *Church*, which introduced it to our notice, is not once found in this master-piece of deception.

THE POINT

WHICH WAS, IN PART, INTERRUPTED BY THE REVIEW,

RESUMED.

It has already been shewn that the application of this word to the Jews in the Old Testament proves that they were once the visible church of God. You have heard, moreover, that it is confessedly used more than a hundred times in the New Testament, to signify the visible church. Now if we or our Baptist friends who agree in this matter, were asked for our proof, how could we answer more properly than by quoting such passages of the New Testament as shew, by their connexion, that the people called the *church*, were a visible society, acting as the consecrated depository of the oracles and ordinances of revealed religion? There are now before me nine authorities⁽ⁿ⁾ which give the name of *ecclesia* to those who had the worship, discipline, character and condition of such a society. Perhaps, there is not a regular Baptist on earth who will deny the conclusion, or deny that it is authorized by these passages of the New Testament. But a good rule will work both ways. If these premises prove the existence of a New Testament church, they will also, if they can be found, prove the existence of an Old Testament church. We are then to look for the worship, discipline, character, and condition of a visible church among the Jews.

(n) Acts xi. 26. xx. 17. xiii. 1. xii. 5. xiv. 23. (comp. 22.) xv. 41. xvi. 5. Matt. xviii. 17. xvi. 18.

I. WORSHIP. “And all the *church* worshipped.”
 “And the whole *church* took counsel to keep other
 “seven days:” ‘in religious exercises,’ as Gill says.(o)
 The religious exercises of the Old Testament were
 such as the following.

1. *Sacrifices*. “For Hezekiah, king of Judah, did
 “give to the *church* a thousand bullocks, and seven
 “thousand sheep: and the princes gave to the *church*
 “a thousand bullocks and ten thousand sheep: and a
 “great number of priests sanctified themselves.”
 “And they brought forth the he-goats for the sin-offer-
 “ing before the king and the *church*; and they laid
 “their hands upon them.” “Then Hezekiah answer-
 “ed and said, Now ye have *consecrated* yourselves
 “unto the Lord, come near, and bring sacrifices, and
 “thank-offerings into the house of the Lord. And the
 “*church* brought in sacrifices and thank-offerings; and
 “as many as were of a free heart, burnt offerings. And
 “the number of the burnt-offerings which the *church*
 “brought, was,” &c.(p)

2. *Festivals*. “For the king had taken counsel, and
 “his princes, and all the *church* in Jerusalem, to keep
 “the passover in the second month.” “And there as-
 “sembled at Jerusalem much people, to keep the feast
 “of unleavened bread in the second month, a very great
 “*church*.” “For there were many in the *church*, that
 “were not *consecrated*: therefore the Levites had the
 “charge of the killing of the passovers, for every one

(o) 2 Chr. xxix. 28. xxx. 23.

(p) 2 Chr. xxx. 24. xxix. 23. 31. 32. xxx. 2.

“that was not clean, to *consecrate* them unto the
“Lord.(*q*)

3. *Prayer*. “And he stood before the altar of the
“Lord in the presence of all the *church of Israel*, and
“spread forth his hands. For Solomon had made a
“brazen scaffold,” “and upon it he stood, and kneeled
“down upon his knees before all the *church of Israel*,
“and spread forth his hands toward heaven.”(*r*) Compare this with certain passages of the New Testament, in which Baptists themselves see evidence that the visible church of God is meant. “Peter, therefore, was
“kept in prison ; but *prayer* was made without ceasing,
“of the *church*, unto God for him.” “Now there
“were, in the *church* that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers.” “And when they had ordained
“them elders in every *church*, and had *prayed* with
“fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom
“they believed.”(*s*)

4. *Praise*. “I will give thee thanks in the great
“*church*, I will praise thee among much people.” The
“great congregation,” as our bible has it in the first
clause of this verse, Dr. Gill explains, “the *church* and
“*people* of God.” The expression in the last clause, he
explains, “the *people* of God meeting together for solemn worship.” The Psalmist says again, “The
“heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Lord ! thy faith-
“fulness also, in the *church* of the saints.” Here Gill
says “holy men are meant, such as are called to be
“saints, and are gathered together in a gospel church-

(*q*) 2 Chr. xxx. 2. 13. 17.

(*r*) 2 Chr. vi. 12. 13.

(*s*) Acts xii. 5. xiii. 1. xiv. 23. (comp. 22.)

state.” The same explanation he gives of the following: “Praise ye the Lord. Sing unto the Lord a new song, and his praise in the *church* of saints.” It is plain that this is directly applicable to the Israelitish *church*, as well as prophetic of the Christian church. The same may be said of the following: “I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the *church* will I praise thee.”(t) Several of these texts mention *singing*, one important means of ecclesiastical praise.(u)

5. *Reading, expounding, and preaching.* “There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua *read* not before all the *church of Israel*, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them.” “And Ezra the priest, brought the law before the *church.*” “So they *read* in the book, in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the *reading.*” “I have *preached* righteousness in the great *church.*”(v) Compare this with the declaration that God anointed Isaiah “to *preach* good tidings unto the meek;” that he anointed our Saviour, the Antitype of Isaiah, “to *preach* the gospel to the poor;” that he actually “*preached* in the synagogues of Galilee:” and compare the whole with what is said of Paul and Barnabas, “that a whole year they assembled themselves with the *church*, and *taught* much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.”(w) Thus does the connexion of the word

(t) Ps. xxxv. 18. lxxxix. 5. cxlix. 1. xxii. 22.

(u) 2 Chr. xxix. 28. Ps. cxlix. 1.

(v) Josh. viii. 35. Neh. viii. 2—8. Ps. xl. 9.

(w) Isa. lxi. 1. Luk. iv. 18. 44. Acts xi. 26.

shew that it denotes a society consecrated to religious purposes, both in the Old and New Testaments.

6. *Implements and places for worship.* “The brazen
 “*altar* that Bezaliel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, had
 “made, he put before the tabernacle of the Lord : and
 “Solomon and the *church* sought unto it.” “So Solo-
 “mon and all the *church* with him, went to the high
 “place that was at Gibeon ; for there was the tabernacle
 “of the *church* of God, which Moses the servant of the
 “Lord had made in the wilderness.” “The heathen
 “entered into her *sanctuary*, whom thou didst com-
 “mand that they should not enter into thy *church*.”
 “And Ezra the priest brought the law before the
 “*church*.” “And he read therein.” “And Ezra the
 “scribe stood upon a *pulpit* of wood which they had
 “made for the purpose.” “And the king turned his
 “face, and blessed the whole *church of Israel*, and all
 “the *church of Israel* stood.” “Even them will I
 “bring to my *holy mountain*, and make them joyful in
 “my *house of prayer* : their burnt offerings and their
 “sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine *altar* ; for mine
 “house shall be called an *house of prayer* for all peo-
 “ple.” “It is written, My *house* shall be called a
 “*house of prayer* ; but ye have made it a den of
 “thieves.”(x) Can any one suppose that when the word
church occurs in the above passages, it means any thing
 short of a visible society, acting as the consecrated de-
 pository of the oracles and ordinances of revealed re-
 ligion ?

(x) 2 Chr. i. 5. 3. Lam. i. 10. Neh. viii. 2. 3. 4. 2 Chr. vi. 3. Isa. lvi. 7. Mat. xxi. 13.

II. DISCIPLINE. The rules by which a society refuses candidates, or expels members, will easily determine whether it is an ecclesiastical body or not.

1. *Preclusion*. Moses points out some characters who “shall not enter into the *church* of the Lord,” until the third generation, others until the tenth, and others never.^(y) If this law goes no farther than to forbid their being invested with ecclesiastical offices, this, nevertheless proves the existence of a church to which those offices are attached. This will appear in the following words of Dr. Gill upon one of these statutes, which, he says, “is to be understood, not of the sanctuary of the Lord, or of being refused admittance into “the church of God, and to join in religious rites, and “partake of sacred ordinances, which all Israelites, and “strangers that were proselytes, had a right unto; such “might bring their offerings, keep the passover, &c.”^(z)

2. *Exclusion*. “But the man that shall be unclean, “and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off “from among the *church*, because he hath *defiled the “sanctuary of the Lord*: the water of *separation* hath “not been sprinkled on him.”^(a) What it is to be thus “cut off,” Gill professes not certainly to know, but among three conjectures, to “be excommunicated from “the *church*,” is one. To be cut off “from the Israelitish *church-state*,” is one of three alternatives which he gives us on another similar statute;^(b) and to

(y) Deut. xxiii. 1—8.

(z) For this, Gill on Deut. xxiii. 1, quotes Ex. xii. 48. 49. Lev. xxii. 18. Num. ix. 14. xv. 14. 15.

(a) Num. xix. 20. (comp. 13, to which Gill refers from the 20th.)

(b) Ex. xii. 19. (comp. 15, to which Gill refers for a fuller explanation.)

“be excommunicated from them as a *church*,” is only a part of the punishment which Dr. Gill believes to be contemplated in one of Ezra’s decrees.(c)

III. CHARACTER. They were no synagogue of Satan, or “congregation of the dead,” as such are called by Solomon.(d) They were not a confused and unlawful assembly, like Demetrius and his Ephesians.(e) Neither were they a civil society, although they were connected with such a body. When, in a certain case, they were called “the whole *church* of the Lord,”(f) Dr. Gill says, “they don’t call them the *congregation* of Israel, “but of the Lord, because it was not on a civil, but “religious account they were come.” As they were not a civil, so they were not a military body, although they were the militant church, and when providentially called, entered the military establishment of their country: as in the case of David and the *Assembly* who were with him, which Dr. Gill says, was a “great part of” “the *congregation* of Israel, and *church* of the living God.”(g) Its members were consecrated to religious privileges and enjoyments. It was given in charge to the Levites “to sanctify them unto the Lord.”(h) This was to prepare them to “worship at his holy hill,” which “holy hill of Zion,” Dr. Gill tells us, means “the church.”(i) To the same amount does he explain Joel’s proclamation for a religious fast, although it speaks of children as belonging to the congregation, and partaking of their consecration and their

(c) Ezr. x. 8.

(d) Prov. xxi. 16.

(e) Acts xix. 32. 39.

(f) Josh. xxii. 16. (g) 1 Sam. xvii. 47.

(h) 2 Chr. xxx. 17.

(i) Ps. xcix. 9.

humiliation. “Gather the people, *sanctify* the church, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breast.”(j) In accordance with this, Gill says that Joshua’s reading to the congregation was “not before the men only, but ‘with the women and the little ones,’ who all had a concern in the things that were read to them.”(k) From this consecration, the officers of the church were, of course, not excluded. “A great number of priests *consecrated* themselves.”(l) This ecclesiastical consecration, as well as spiritual sanctification, appears to be contemplated in calling the Jews and the Christians, “the *church* of saints.”(m) Their imperfection in spiritual sanctification is confessed by all parties, and taught in the scriptures. Sacrifices are appointed for a case in which “the whole *church* of Israel sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the *church*.”(n) This is the text by which Gill and Ainsworth prove “that the *church* may err.” But on account of their perfect Head, and that degree of sanctification which they enjoy, the scriptures call them “the *church* of the upright,”(o) and recognize an evident incongruity between church-membership and a life of iniquity. “I was almost in all evil in the midst of the *church assembled*.”(p) These things evidently shew that they are a visible society, acting as the consecrated depository of the oracles and ordinances of revealed religion.

IV. CONDITION. On that text which speaks of the

(j) Joel ii. 16. (comp. 15. 17.) (k) Josh. viii. 35.

(l) 2 Chr. xxx. 24. (m) Ps. lxxxix. 5. cxlix. 1.

(n) Lev. iv. 13. (o) Ps. cxi. 1. (p) Prov. v. 14.

trumpets which were made “for the calling of the *church*, and for the journeying of the camps,(q) Dr. Gill takes occasion to remark that the Christian church is in the same condition: “Saints are pilgrims and travellers; they are passing through a wilderness, their way is attended with many difficulties; Canaan is the place they are travelling to, and the gospel [like the trumpets] is of singular use to them by the way both to refresh them with its joyful sound, and to direct them in the path in which they should go.” But an inspired writer has said concerning Christ’s presence with the Israelites, “This is he that was in the *church* in the wilderness, with the angel, which spake to him in the Mount Sina, and with our fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us.”(r) The context shews that this person who was with them, was the Divine prophet, priest and king of the visible church, and it connects him and them with the tabernacle and temple which were ecclesiastical buildings; and thus shews that “the *church* in the wilderness” was really, and not nominally only, the visible church of God. Dr. Gill says that this “must be understood of the children of Israel, who were the then *church* of God, whom he had chosen and separated from the rest of the world, to be a peculiar people to himself, to whom were given the *word* and *ordinances*, the *service* of God, and the *promises*; and God always had, and will have a *church*; though that is sometimes in the wilderness; which has been the case under the gospel

(q) Num. x. 2.

(r) Acts vii. 38. (comp. 37. 44. 47.)

“ dispensation, as well as before ; See Rev. xxii. 6. 14,
 “ and it was a peculiar honour to Moses, that he was in
 “ this *church*, though it was in the wilderness ; even a
 “ greater honour than to be in Pharaoh’s court.” In
 accordance with this, Paul quotes David, as saying for
 himself and for his Antitype, concerning Jews and
 Christians, “ I will declare thy name unto my brethren ;
 “ in the midst of the *church* will I sing praise unto
 “ thee.”(s)

You were told some time ago, of my Opponent’s
 statement, that “ the term *church* or kirk, is an abbre-
 “ viation of the word *κυριου οικος*, *the house of the Lord*,
 and does not translate the term *εκκλησια*.” But if *εκκλησια*
church, has a different meaning from *κυριου οικος*, *the house*
of the Lord, then it must certainly have a different
 meaning from *θεου οικος*, *the house of God*. Yet let us
 hear Paul’s account of this matter, according to Mac-
 knight’s version, from which my Opponent, contrary to
 promise, has grievously departed, in his New Transla-
 tion. The Apostle gives certain instructions to Timo-
 thy, “ that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to
 “ behave thyself *εν οικω θεου*, *in the house of God*, which
 “ is *εκκλησια θεου ζωντος* *the church of the living God*.”(t)
 Here is an inspired declaration that *the church* means
 the same as *the house of God*, and of course, that it
 means the same as *the house of the Lord*, my Opponent’s
 declaration to the contrary notwithstanding. When

(s) Hebr. ii. 12. (comp. context.)

(t) 1 Tim. iii. 15.

Peter tells the churches that “the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God ;”(u) Dr. Gill says, “By the house of God is either meant the temple of Jerusalem,” “or else the *church* of God, which is frequently called the house of God.” When Paul says that we have “an high priest over the house of God,”(v) Gill says that it means “the *church* of God, over which Christ is as prophet, priest, and king, and as the son and owner of it.” When Paul says “every house is builded by some man,” Gill understands it of “the whole *church* in general, of particular congregations, and of individual believers.” When Paul says “he that built all things is God,” Gill explains it “of Christ, and of his building the *church*.”(w) This explanation he still continues, when it is intimated that Moses belonged to that house, as it is repeatedly, in the Epistle to the Hebrews.(x) When it is said that “Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant,”(y) Gill says, “a servant in holy things ;” He says, “he was not a servant in the world, and with respect to civil things, and the affairs of Providence, but in the *church* of God, and in divine things.” And as the scriptures never once intimate that this church began with Moses, so neither does our great Baptist Commentator ; but in the very same passage in which he says that “it was a peculiar honour to Moses that he was in this church,” he also says that “God always had, and will have a church.”(z)

(u) 1 Pet. iv. 17. (v) Hebr. x. 21. (comp. v. 6.) (w) Hebr. iii. 4.

(x) Hebr. iii. 2. 3. (y) Hebr. iii. 5.

(z) Gill on Acts vii. 38, quoted above.

To me it seems that a small part of the evidence which has been adduced, ought to convince any one of the truth of the proposition, that Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God. They have been shewn to have the oracles and ordinances of a visible church, the members and officers of a visible church, with the constitution and the express, inspired, and unequivocal name of a church. Under this last point, they have been shewn to have the worship of an ecclesiastical body, such as sacrifices and festivals, prayer and praise, reading, expounding and preaching, together with ecclesiastical implements and places for worship, such as the altar and pulpit, the tabernacle and temple, which latter is called, in the Old and New Testament, the house of prayer. Under this point, it was proved, moreover, that they had the discipline of a church, in respect of preclusion and exclusion, and that the scriptures attributed to them the character and condition of a visible church. The existence, therefore, of the Patriarchal or Old Testament church, is as certain as the existence of the Christian or New Testament church. And some of you are ready to say that if my remaining propositions are as irrefragably proved as this first one, then the conclusion in favour of infant-baptism is inevitable. We proceed then to

PROPOSITION II.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IS A BRANCH OF THE ABRAHAMIC CHURCH: OR, IN OTHER WORDS, THE JEWISH SOCIETY BEFORE CHRIST, AND THE CHRISTIAN SOCIETY AFTER CHRIST, ARE ONE AND THE SAME CHURCH IN DIFFERENT ADMINISTRATIONS.

You will be at no loss to account for my calling the Christian church a branch of the Abrahamic, when you remember that this is the figure used by Paul on the same subject. The Jews he considers the natural branches which are now cut off, and the Gentiles he treats as foreign branches engrafted in their place.^(a) As our proposition is scriptural, both in phraseology and doctrine, my Opponent, for the want of argument, falls into a rhetorical ecstasy, about the inferiority of a branch to the stock, and the consequent inferiority of the Christian to the Jewish church, if my language be correct. On this ground he says that I can “be put to silence by “every stripling who could ask the following question; “Is not *a branch* inferior to the stem or trunk from “which it grows?”^(b) I suppose my Opponent’s strippling would hardly deny that the superiority of a branch to the trunk into which it is inserted, is the very reason why engrafting is generally practised. But the scriptures say, “behold the man whose name is The “BRANCH.” “Behold I will raise unto David a right- “eous BRANCH.” “And there shall come forth a *rod* “out of the *stem* of Jesse, and a BRANCH shall grow out

(a) Rom. xi. 16—24.

(b) Mr. Campbell’s Spurious Debate with me, p. 134.

“of his roots.”(c) These passages evidently represent Immanuel as a *branch* of the stock of David, and David as a branch of the stem of Jesse. Now I will let my Opponent or his stripling say, whether Messiah the *Branch* was not greater than the *stock* of David, and whether David the *branch* was not greater than the *stem* of Jesse.

The proposition in hand is sufficiently guarded in respect of the *sameness* of the Jewish and Christian societies. It says nothing more than that they are the *same church*; and nothing more than *ecclesiastical identity* is intended. You know that that lofty tree has not changed its identity since it was a plant of a foot high. Each of my hearers believes that he has, at this moment, the *same body* with which he was born. The constant mutation of its constituent particles never makes you doubt your *personal identity*. The adjacent town of Washington(d) is governed by the same board of Trustees from its foundation to the present day, although, perhaps, not one individual remains of those who originally composed it. When the Baptist church claims the Petrobrussian church, and the Waldensian church, and the Primitive church as belonging to their church, they must mean nothing more than that ecclesiastical identity which we say subsists between the Jewish and Christian societies. The change of administration can hardly make a greater difference between these, than the change of condition makes between the church militant and the church triumphant, which are nevertheless

(c) Zech. vi. 12. Jer. xxiii. 5. Is. xi. 1.

(d) The first two days of the debate were in a forest near the town.

the same church in different states ; my Opponent to the contrary notwithstanding.(e)

This view of ecclesiastical sameness, my Opponent considers “ as absurd as to say, that the human body and the soul are one and the same thing,” as if there were no difference between “ flesh and spirit.”(f) As the human soul and body, though distinct beings, do really form one person, they would afford a good illustration, if they did not exist simultaneously, but in succession, as do the Jewish and Christian churches. My Opponent’s sophism concerning the supposed identity of a horse and an elephant, because they are both creatures ;(g) or, (if he would prefer it,) the identity of a quibbler, and a monkey, because they are both empty chatterers, would answer very well, provided he will first establish the doctrine of metempsychosis, a doctrine fully as correct as some which he holds at present.

On this subject the Appendix to my Opponent’s spurious Debate with Mr. Walker(h) has several questions which it is convenient to answer.

“ 1. Are not a constitution, laws, ordinances, subjects, and privileges, the chief constituents of a church state ?”

The visible church is a visible society, acting as the consecrated depository of the oracles and ordinances of revealed religion.

“ 2. Was the constitution that erected the Jewish nation into a national church, the same as the New Testament, or constitution of the Christian Church ?”

(e) Spur. Deb. with me. p. 193.

(g) Spur. Deb. with me. p. 83.

(f) Spur. Deb. with me. p. 155.

(h) p. 195.

The Abrahamic covenant is the constitution of the visible church under the Jewish and Christian administrations.

“3. Were the laws that regulated the worship, discipline, political economy, judicial proceedings, and common intercourse of the Jews, the same as those under which the disciples of Christ act?”

It has been ably proved by Pedobaptists, and is maintained by Dr. Gill, the greatest Baptist that ever lived, that the political economy of the Jews was distinct from their ecclesiastical economy. But, in the present case, the one serves as a very convenient illustration of the other. As the national identity of Israel was not destroyed by the change of their government from judges to kings, so the ecclesiastical identity of God's people is not destroyed by the transfer of their privileges from Jews to Gentiles. After this transfer, the Baptists themselves must confess that the government of the church-general underwent many alterations, while the body remained the same. If I mistake not, the Baptists generally believe in opposition to us, that the government of the Apostolical churches was an Independent Congregationalism. This they probably admit gave place to a confederated parochial Episcopacy, or what is now called Presbyterianism, as early as the days of Ignatius and Polycarp. And they cannot deny that Dioscesan Episcopacy, or full-blooded Prelacy, was the government of the same church, in the days of Cyprian and Augustine. Neither can they deny, that, at present, there is a great variety of laws and modes of discipline, in the various branches of the Baptist church, which in their view, do not

destroy their identity with the church of John the Baptist, or with one another.⁽ⁱ⁾

“ 4. Were the ordinances of the Jewish state, the same, with regard to their import, times of observance, number, the character and quality of the observers or participants of them?”

There was a difference in form, yet a substantial sameness in the passover, and the eucharist, and in circumcision and baptism, as we hope to shew fully in its place. Circumstantial differences effect not the substance.

“ 5. Are the subjects of the Christian church to be such in birth, education, temper, and character, as the subjects of the commonwealth of Israel?”

They are the same thus far, that they should be believers and their seed.

“ 6. Are the privileges enjoyed by Christians in the church of Christ, just the same as those enjoyed by the Jews?”

Privileges, whether in church or state, may be enlarged or restricted, created or suppressed, without affecting the identity of the body. The repeal of the edict of Nantz did not annihilate the French nation, neither did the toleration act under William the Third, create a new nation in England: neither did these decrees affect the identity of churches, Popish or Protestant, Conformist or Non-conformist, in France or England. Virginia would still be Virginia, if she were

(i) If, by *common intercourse*, in this third question, is meant domestic intercourse, such as is contemplated in Lev. xx. 18. Ez. xviii. 6, I say that those particular laws are still binding. If he have regard to social intercourse, I say that we are now permitted to eat with unbelievers.

to extend the right of suffrage to her poorest citizen, and Pennsylvania would still be Pennsylvania, if she were to compel Preachers and Quakers to perform military duty. These United States would still be the same, (though somewhat disgraced,) if they were to give constitutional permission to the society of Cincinnati, to wear an empty honorary title of nobility. And the Presbyterian church would be the same, (though somewhat enhanced in value,) if, while they advocate a parity of clergy, they would, like Martin Luther, leave their *Doctorates* in Egypt, where those vain and invidious distinctions were born. If a change in respect of privilege must destroy identity, then Joseph was not the same person in prison and in the office of prime-minister to Pharaoh.

“ 7. When he(*j*) has answered the first question in “ the affirmative, and the next five in the negative, “ (which, if he consults the holy oracles, he must,) then “ how are two things *the same*, which *differ* in every “ *essential* particular?”

The author of the above questions does not know what is *essential*, and what is not *essential* to a church. He considers not only ordinances, but “times of observance,” *essential*. The excommunication of the Asiatic church, by the Roman Bishop, because they differed from him in their *time of observing* Easter, must please my Opponent much: for they ought to be out of the church, when they lack that which is *essential* to the church. If uniformity in “times of observance” be

(*j*) These questions were addressed to Dr. Ely.

essential to ecclesiastical identity, then those whose sabbath begins at sunset, and those whose sabbath begins at midnight, cannot both belong to the Christian church; because they lack that which is essential to being in the same church. He might as well say that two persons cannot be members of the same family, or citizens of the same state, unless they observe precisely the same time in eating and sleeping. There are four things essential to the visible church: *visibility, association, consecration, and investiture*; by which last I mean, being intrusted with the oracles and ordinances of revealed religion. Now the Jewish and Christian societies were thus invested, and were consecrated to this trust, for which they were visibly associated. As both, therefore, were visible associations, and both were consecrated depositories, they both had all the essentials of God's church on earth; and no possible difference could hinder their amalgamation, any more than the difference between olive trees would make engrafting impossible, or the difference between different countries would prove an insurmountable obstacle to making a British subject an American citizen by naturalization.

My Opponent's eleven objections to the sameness of the Jewish and Christian societies, I shall have to notice concisely in an order of my own.

1. My Opponent's sixth argument is founded upon our Saviour's consolatory address to his small family; "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." (z) It was pru-

(z) Luke xx. 32. Spur. Deb. with me. p. 228.

dent for my Opponent to spend but little of his breath in showing that this text excludes the Old Testament society from God's ecclesiastical kingdom, because if it does prove that, it must also prove that the Christian church must always be a little flock, even in the millennium, and in the kingdom of glory.

2. My Opponent's seventh argument is founded upon Matt. xix. 28. "And Jesus said unto them, verily I say "unto you, that ye which have followed me in the rege-
"neration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne
"of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones,
"judging the twelve tribes of Israel."(a) He gives it to us in Campbell's translation, which uses the word *renovation* instead of *regeneration*, intimating that this renovation means the institution of the Christian church. My Opponent then says, "Observe here the erection of
"this new kingdom is called emphatically THE RENO-
"VATION; in the common translation THE REGENERA-
"TION, not *the continuation* of the Jewish church."

My Opponent has considerable versatility of genius. When he is at a loss for proof, he can turn any thing into evidence by merely making it emphatical. By this means he can even impress opposite arguments into his service. All that they need is a due degree of emphasis. When our Saviour promised to *build* his church, my Opponent discovered that to *build* a church was very different from *rebuilding* or *repairing* a church; for *rebuilding* and *repairing* supposed a previous existence of a church which had fallen into decay.

(a) Matt. xix. 28. in Spur. Deb. against me, p. 228.

But now he lays an emphasis upon *regeneration* and *renovation*, words equivalent to *rebuilding* and *repairing*, and makes out that they do not presuppose existence, but the very contrary.

3. His tenth argument is founded upon a passage which, (strange as it may seem,) is a direct proof of the identity of the Jewish and Christian societies, according to my proposition. “For he is our peace, who hath
“made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall
“of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh
“the enmity, even the law of commandments contained
“in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new
“man, so making peace.”(b) According to him, this proves that Jews and Gentiles are emphatically made BOTH ONE, ONE NEW MAN, that is, ONE NEW CHURCH. Very well. So says Dr. Gill also. And so be it. My Opponent, however, believes it to be a new church, as to its essence, and I believe it to be a new church, as to its administration. The second temple was, in one sense a *new* temple, but in another, it was only a *renovation* of the *old* temple. So the higher gate of the temple, which Jotham repaired, is twice called by Jeremiah “the *new* gate,”(c) in consequence of its *repairs*, although it was as *old* as the temple. This same prophet says concerning the Lord’s mercies “they are *new* every
“morning;”(d) which Gill justly explains, by saying that they are “daily *renewed* in the manifestations thereof.” John says, “I write no *new* commandment unto you,
“but an *old* commandment, which ye had from the be-

(b) Eph. ii. 14. 15. Spur. Deb. ag. me, p. 235.

(c) Jer. xxvi. 10. xxxvi. 10. (comp. 2 Kgs. xv. 35.)

(d) Lam. iii. 23.

“ginning.” This, Dr. Gill thinks, is the law of love. And the same law of love, he thinks, is meant in the next verse, which says, “A new commandment I write unto you.”(e) This he says, “is the same with the former, considered in different respects. The command of brotherly love is a *new* one; that is, it is an excellent one, as a *new* name is an excellent name, and a *new* song is an excellent one.” So the Jews and Gentiles are now united in one *new* man, or *new* church, because there is now a *new* administration, and one which far excels the *old*.

4. My Opponent’s eleventh argument is based upon Paul’s declaration that we have *received* “a kingdom which cannot be moved.”(f) He thinks the word *kingdom* here means the New Testament church, and that these words, with the context, amount to a proof that there is an essential difference between the Jewish and Christian societies, as the one can be moved and the other cannot.

If this argument prove that these two bodies cannot be one church, then it will also prove that a human soul and body cannot form one person; for the one can be removed by death, and the other cannot. But, if Providence permit, I hope, in due time, to lay before you plain scriptural evidence that the ecclesiastical *kingdom* of God embraces both the Jewish and Christian administrations. When, however, the word *kingdom* is used to denote the latter *administration* to the exclusion of the former, it has, of course, the precedency in point of dig-

(e) 1 John, ii. 7. 8.

(f) Hebr. xii. 28. Spur. Decb. with mc. p. 236.

nity and stability, as the soul excels the body with which it is united. That this word does sometimes signify *administration*, both in church and state, will not be difficult to prove by my Opponent himself. Where our translation says, “the *kingdom* of heaven is likened unto a certain king,” my Opponent’s New Testament reads, “the *administration* of heaven resembleth that of a king.”(h) This is a copy of Dr. George Campbell, and accords with his Preliminary Dissertation on this word, in which he says that “in some of the parables, it evidently means *administration*, or *method of governing*.”(i) Now that the Jewish administration is removed, and that the Christian administration of the church never will be removed, I have never denied. But in the same part of Dr. Campbell’s dissertation, he mentions a parable, in which “the word denotes *royalty* or *royal authority* ;” and it so happens that the phraseology of that parable is exactly parallel to that of the text on which this argument of my Opponent rests. This text speaks of our “*receiving a kingdom* which cannot be moved.” The parable uses such an expression twice. “A certain nobleman went into a far country, to *receive* for himself a *kingdom*, and to return,” “having *received the kingdom*.”(j)

Instead of “to receive for himself a kingdom,” Dr. Campbell’s translation has it, “to *procure* for himself *royalty*,” and instead of “having received the kingdom,” the Dr. renders it “*vested with royal power*.” My Opponent promised that his translation should be a

(h) Matt. xviii. 23.

(j) Luke xix. 12. 13.

(i) Dissert. 5. Part. 1. Sect. 7.

copy of Dr. Campbell's; and, for a remarkable thing, he has made no other alteration than to insert our definite article before *royalty*. Remember that my Opponent has pronounced Dr. Campbell "the first translator " in point of correctness and elegance that ever gave a " version of any part of the scriptures." And for this reason he has altered the versions of Macknight and Doddridge, to make them conformable to him. Why, therefore, did he not read his favourite text, "being *vested* with a *royalty* which cannot be moved?" He cannot plead a scrupulous regard to his promise that he would copy Macknight: for that very verse which he has given us as Macknight's translation, is a heterogeneous mixture of Macknight, Thomson, and a certain gentleman who boasts much of his critical acumen. Neither can he plead that the proposed rendering would materially differ from Macknight, in *sentiment*: for Macknight, in his commentary, expressly declares that the word *kingdom* in that text, means "that excellent *dispensation* of religion," which I have called the Christian *administration*. Another hint of his, which may tend to the farther elucidation of this text, is, that this *kingdom* which we *receive*, was "foretold by Daniel to be given to the saints." Daniel says, "The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom."^(k) Gill says, "or *receive* it, as a free gift from God:" which latter translation he informs us is agreeable to Munster, Piscator, and the Tigurine version. He claims the Chaldaic Original also: but this may be rendered either *take* or

(k) Dan. vii. 18.

receive, as may also the Septuagint, although it has the identical verb which is correctly rendered *receive*, in Paul's text, quoted as the basis of my Opponent's argument. Now let us compare the Prophet and Apostle. The latter says, "We having *received* a *kingdom* [or *royalty*] which cannot be moved." The former says, "The saints of the Most High shall *receive* the *kingdom* [or *royalty*] and possess the *kingdom* [or *royal power*] for ever, even for ever and ever." It is remarkable that this view is as unequivocally approved by Dr. Gill's Commentary as by Dr. Campbell's Dissertation. Daniel's promise that the saints "shall receive the kingdom," Dr. Gill explains by saying "they shall have the *rule* and *government* in the world." This interpretation is corroborated by many passages in the Septuagint, which I need not take time to repeat.^(l) Permit me, however, to add one more instance from my Opponent's translation to the same amount. John speaks of a woman, who (literally) "hath a kingdom over the kings of the earth."^(m) Instead of "hath a kingdom," our Translation says, *reigneth*, and my Opponent says *ruleth*. This supports Dr. Gill's interpretation that to *receive the kingdom*, is to *have the rule and government*; or to *obtain royalty*, according to Dr. Campbell. Peter tells believers that they are "a *royal* priesthood." But the Septuagint applies this very same title to pious Jews, and it is translated, "a *royal* priesthood," by Thomson.⁽ⁿ⁾ Their ecclesiastical administration,

(l) See particularly Dan. v. 31. 2 Sam. v. 12. Also 1 Sam. xxiv. 20. xxviii. 17. 2 Sam. iii. 10. 1 Kgs. ii. 22, and a number of other places.

(m) Rev. xvii. 18.

(n) Ex. xix. 6. 1 Pet. ii. 9.

however, was moveable ; whereas the present administration is “ a *royalty* which cannot be moved :” but is like the believer’s “ *crown* of glory that fadeth not away.”

5. Several of my Opponent’s eleven reasons for denying the ecclesiastical identity of the Jewish and Christian societies have now been answered. His first, second, third, fifth and eighth,^(o) which have not yet been noticed, all relate to this kingdom or ecclesiastical house, of which we have already been speaking, and may be more conveniently answered in that part of my defence, in which I hope to prove more fully, that the house, or the kingdom of God, embraces the Jewish and Christian administrations. His fourth and ninth reasons^(p) relate to the terms of admission, *circumcision* and *baptism*. These will be effectually answered by proving, as I hope to do, under my third proposition, that circumcision and Baptism are one and the same seal in substance, though in different forms.

After the attention which has now been given to my Opponent’s objections to the proposition in hand, the evidence upon which I rest my belief that the Jewish and Christian societies are the same church, may reasonably be expected. This shall be given under three heads ; the sameness of their religion, of their names, and of their covenant. The first amounts to a strong probability, the two last to an absolute certainty.

(o) Spur. Deb. pp. 195. 197. 209. 229. (p) Spur. Deb. pp. 197. 234.

POINT I.

God gave to the Jewish society before Christ, and the Christian society after Christ, essentially the same RELIGION.

An eminent writer, (q) in explaining the word *religion*, says that “in a practical sense, it is generally considered as the same with *godliness*.” It is godliness, or piety, or experimental religion that is meant, when some entreat their friends to get religion, or express a hope that they have got heart-religion; expressions which my Opponent considers “very vague,” and “very much at random.” (r) Perhaps he knows more of what the Apostle James calls a vain religion.

“The religions which exist in the world have been generally divided into four, the Pagan, the Jewish, the Mahometan, and the Christian.” (s) Paul says, “After the most straitest sect of our *religion*, I lived a Pharisee.” (t) The same Apostle tells the Galatians that he had his “conversation in time past in *Judaism*,” and that he “profited in *Judaism*,” in both of which instances, our translators render it “the *Jews’ religion*.” (u) In one of the few times in which the word for *religion* occurs in the Greek Testament, it is rendered *worshipping*: “Let no man beguile you of your reward in a “voluntary humility, and *worshipping* of angels.” (v) This *angel-religion* is very general, and embraces all the four sorts which have been mentioned. It is an

(q) Buck, in his Theological Dictionary.

(r) Spur. Deb. pp. 150. 151. (s) Buck’s Theol. Dict.

(t) Acts xxvi. 5. (u) Gal. i. 13. 14. (v) Col. ii. 18.

important and conspicuous feature in the religion of the Pagans, Jews, Mahometans, and Christians. But this religion was not known to the Jews, until their subjection to the Babylonians, and it was not called Christianity, until the Anti-christian apostacy. We see, therefore, that there are two sorts of Judaism, as Paul informs us,^(w) and two sorts of Christianity, as James assures us.^(x) Now I will very readily admit, with my Opponent, that degenerate Judaism is essentially different from Primitive Christianity: but it was also essentially different from Primitive Judaism, as found in their inspired standards; just as Popish Christianity is essentially different from Primitive Christianity, as found in our infallible standards.

When I say that God gave the same religion to Jews and Christians, I mean that the religion of the Old Testament and that of the New are essentially the same, notwithstanding the great difference in the two administrations. My Opponent says, Nay. While I undertake to prove this point, it gives me pleasure to remember that all real christians are in my favour; not even the Baptists excepted. In speaking of the two silver trumpets used by the Jewish Church, Dr. Gill says, “The number *two* may be applicable to the two dispensations, under which the gospel has been ministered, directing to the same Saviour, and to the same way of salvation, by his grace, his blood, righteousness, and sacrifice; and to the two Testaments, which agree in the same truths respecting his person, offices, obe-

(w) Rom. ii. 28. 29.

(x) James i. 26. 27.

“ dience, sufferings, and death ; and to the prophets
 “ and apostles of both dispensations and testaments, who
 “ have united in laying Christ as the foundation.”^(y)

The Dictionary of Dr. Allison, the Baptist preacher, says that the word *religion* means “ a system of divine *faith* and *worship*, as opposite to others.” If the Old and New Testaments contain not only the same system of *faith*, but of *practice*, not only the same *worship* substantially, but the same system of *government* and *discipline*, then they must contain the same *religion*. As this is a subject, which alone might occupy more than a week, I can do little more than point out the general features of the Jewish and Christian systems, and refer you to a few obvious scripture proofs. This shall be done under the following particulars.

I. THEOLOGY. The scriptures of both Testaments contain the doctrine of the unity of essence, and Trinity of persons, in the true God ; of the person, offices, and work of Christ ; of original sin, regeneration, justification, &c. Paul says, “ We declare unto you glad tidings, “ how that the promise which was made unto the Fathers, “ [the Jews,] God hath fulfilled the same unto us, their “ children, [the Christians,] in that he hath raised up “ Jesus again.” “ Seeing it is one God which shall “ justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision “ through faith.”^(z) Peter says, “ We believe that “ through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we, “ [the Christians,] shall be saved, even as they, [the “ Jews.]”^(a) Understanding him here to mean “ the

(y) Gill on Num. x. 2. (z) Acts xiii. 32. Rom. iii. 30. (a) Acts xv. 11.

Jewish fathers," Gill says, " For they were justified, " pardoned, accepted, and saved, in the same way, as " the saints under the New Testament are : They could " not keep the law perfectly, nor was there then, nor " even now, salvation by it, only by the grace of Christ ; " and in that way, and that only, Old and New Testa- " ment believers, Jews and Gentiles, whether circum- " cised or uncircumcised, are saved. The Gentiles " were not saved by the light of nature, nor the Jews " by the law of Moses ; the one were not lost for " want of circumcision, nor the other saved by it ; the " only way of salvation to both, and under all dispen- " sations, is the Lord Jesus Christ." Paul says, " They " which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." " Which shews," says Dr. Gill, " that the *faith* of Old " and New Testament saints, Jews and Gentiles, is the " same ; their blessings the same, and so their eternal " happiness ; they have the same God and Father, the " same Mediator and Redeemer, are actuated and influ- " enced by the same Spirit, partake of the same grace, " and shall share the same glory."(b)

II. MORALITY. Moses and the Prophets contain a perfectly pure moral law, of which the Decalogue may be considered an inspired compend. Concerning this our Saviour says, " Think not that I am come to " destroy the law, or the prophets ; I am not come to " destroy, but to fulfil."(c) Moses says, " Thou shalt " love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, and with " all thy soul, and with all thy might." Christ says,

(b) Gal. iii. 9, is thus expounded by Gill in his commentary on Matt. viii. 11.

(c) Ex. xx. 3—17. Matt. v. 17.

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,
 “and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and
 “with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.”(d)
 Moses says, “Speak unto all the congregation of the
 “children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be
 “holy, for I the Lord your God am holy.” Peter says,
 “As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in
 “all manner of conversation: because it is written, Be
 “ye holy, for I am holy.”(e)

III. WORSHIP. Here I need not dwell on the substantial evidence of the most important ordinances, the Passover and the Eucharist, or of circumcision and baptism, which may be fully considered hereafter, but I would merely refer you to what has been already proved concerning the worship of the Jewish church; such as reading and preaching, praying and praising, &c.

IV. GOVERNMENT. This was by *Presbyters* or *Elders*. Moses says, “And the *Elders* of the congregation shall lay their hands,” &c. The Psalmist says, “Let them exalt him also in the congregation of the people, and praise him in the assembly of the *Elders*.” Luke says “And when they had ordained them *Elders* in every church.”(f)

V. DISCIPLINE. This concerns disciples, in respect of their initiation and their regulation.

1. *Initiation*. That faith is necessary in an adult proselyte, under the New Testament, is urged by both parties, from the words, “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.” But one of the most remark-

(d) Deut. vi. 5. Luke x. 27.

(e) Lev. xix. 2. 1 Pet. i. 15. 16.

(f) Lev. iv. 15. Ps. ciii. 32. Acts xiv. 23.

able proofs of this is found in the words of Paul, where he shews that God demanded the same prerequisite to legitimate membership in the Jewish church. “ Well; “ because of unbelief, they [the Jews] were broken off, “ and thou [the Christian church] standest by “ faith.”(*g*) And let it be marked, that in both churches, believers and their households are initiated.

2. *Regulation.* Without taking time to quote the authorities at large, I will just tell you, in a few words, what you know can be easily proved on this subject. In both the Old and New Testament churches, an offender must be told of his fault ;(*h*) in both, a penitent must be forgiven ;(*i*) and in both, the impenitent must be cut off.(*j*)

POINT II.

The Scriptures give to the Jewish and Christian societies the same NAMES, in such a manner as plainly to prove that they are the same church.

This has the appearance, and only the appearance, of contradicting the following prophecies. “ The Gentiles “ shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and “ thou [the Jewish church] shalt be called by a new name, “ which the mouth of the Lord shall name.” “ And “ ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen ; “ for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants “ by another name.”(*k*) A diversity of names, in one

(*g*) Mk. xvi. 16. Rom. xi. 20.

(*i*) Lev. iv. 20. Luke xvii. 3.

(*k*) Is. lxii. 2. lxxv. 15.

(*h*) Lev. xix. 17. Mat. xviii. 15.

(*j*) Deut. xvii. 12. Mat. xviii. 17.

respect, is consistent with an identity of names in another respect. But even this prophecy concerning the change of name, proves the sameness of the churches. It is not said that the Jews had been called by one name, and another people should be called by another name; but it is, in a certain sense, the same people, whose name is to be altered. “And *thou* shalt be called by a new name.” While the name was to be altered, the people were to continue the same. Yet how the same? Not nationally; for those who bore the old name were Jews, and those who were to bear the new name were Gentiles: they were the same people, therefore, considered as the church, the *professed servants* of God; for he says that he will “call his *servants* by another name.” This change of name only points out the change of administration, while an inter-community of names shews the sameness of the church.

This inter-community of names is visible throughout the scriptures. Moses calls the Jews, God’s *peculiar treasure, a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation*. Peter calls the Christians “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.”⁽¹⁾ There are also many other figurative appellations which, in their connexion, shew clearly that these two administrations are called by the same name, because they are, ecclesiastically, the same thing. It is in this sense, that they are called a tree and vineyard; a foundation, floor, and house; a kingdom and commonwealth; man and body; brethren, bride, and children.

(1) Ex. xix. 5. 6. 1 Pet. ii. 9.

I. TREE. Of this the Apostle Paul speaks largely in his Epistle to the Romans.^(m) My Opponent, in his Spurious Debate with Mr. Walker,⁽ⁿ⁾ speaks of it as follows, viz. “Distinguished commentators have found
 “it extremely difficult to comprehend every thing the
 “Apostle says in this eleventh chapter. Therefore, we
 “find the ablest of them differing among themselves.
 “One cause of this difficulty, I presume, is the Apos-
 “tle’s so frequently referring from one part of the sub-
 “ject to another——so often stating and applying his
 “remarks in sudden transitions from Jews to Gentiles.
 “Another difficulty in expounding the metaphors is,
 “that the engrafting spoken of, appears to be predica-
 “ted upon a mistaken view of grafting. A wild olive
 “into a good olive, does not improve the wild olive; the
 “fruit being similar to the cion engrafted, and not simi-
 “lar to the stalk. But the Apostle’s design was to shew
 “that the Gentiles partook equally with the Jew, as the
 “engrafted cion equally partakes with the natural
 “branch, in the sap and vigour of the root.”

If I am not egregiously mistaken, my Opponent has, in this extract, displayed a modesty to which he is usually a stranger. He generally speaks as if those subjects which puzzled and divided the ablest commentators were perfectly translucent to his penetrating eye. He not unfrequently spurns the opinion of the most distinguished expositors, Baptist as well as Pedobaptist; and advances his own dogmas with the lofty confidence, of one who had a grain of intelligence diluted with an

(m) Rom. xi. 16—24.

(n) p. 28. Note.

ounce of self-conceit. But when he comes to the Abrahamic Olive-tree, with its Jewish and Gentile branches, his confidence for a while forsakes him; it is all involved in obscurity, to himself and to the ablest commentators, if not to Paul also. He even sees something in the sacred text, very much resembling those “far-fetched analogies and inaccurate reasonings” which Unitarians often discover in the Apostle’s writings. He tells us that “the engrafting spoken of appears to be predicated upon a *mistaken* view of grafting.” If the Apostle was not *mistaken*, my Opponent certainly is, for they differ very much from each other. But there is no reason to believe that the Apostle’s views of grafting were different from those of every practical man among you. You practice engrafting, that you may improve the fruit, by a change of the branches, while there is no change in the root, the trunk, or the sap. So Paul, with the ecclesiastical Olive-tree. Its root, trunk, and fatness remained; its branches only were changed: and whether it was not an improvement, to exchange infidel for believing branches, to exchange the Jewish for the Christian administration, judge ye. This opinion does not suffer by a closer examination.

1. *The root.* It is equally consistent with the Pedobaptist system, to consider this as referring to Christ or to Abraham, the original or derived root. When the figure of a building instead of a tree is used, the prophets and apostles are spoken of as a *foundation*, but Christ is the foundation of foundations. When Christ is

said to be “ the *root* and the offspring of David,” (*o*) the sense is, that he is the Father as well as the son of David. But Abraham is said to be “ the Father of circumcision ” [that is, of ecclesiastical initiation] to them who are “ not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the “ steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he “ had, being yet uncircumcised.” (*p*) His very name *Abraham*, signifies a *high father*, and it was given to him, because he was to be a father not to the Jews only, but to many nations : that is, he was the *root* of that ecclesiastical tree, which bore both Jewish and Christian branches.

If, instead of to Abraham, you should apply this figure to the seed of the woman, revealed to Adam, and worshipped by Abel, Seth, Enoch, and Noah, I see no ground of objection ; since Christ is really the Head of the church visible, as well as invisible. This is evident from his representing himself as a vine, from which fruitless branches are cut off. The invisible church has no fruitless branches, and from it none can be cut off. My Opponent says, “ Pardon, justification, sanctification, “ and salvation, are inseparably connected ; ” and gives Paul on perseverance, to prove it. Dr. Gill says, “ There are two sorts of branches in Christ the vine ; “ the one sort are such who have only an historical “ faith in him, believe but for a time, and are removed ; “ they are such who only profess to believe in him, as “ Simon Magus did ; are in him by profession only.” “ These are the other sort of branches, who are

(*o*) Rev. xxii. 16.

(*p*) Rom. iv. 12.

“truly and savingly in Christ; such as are *rooted* in him.”(q)

2. *The fatness.* The engrafted branches are said to partake “of the root and *fatness* of the olive-tree.” This means ecclesiastical ordinances; as when David says, “They shall be abundantly satisfied with the *fatness* of thy house.”(r) Dr. Gill says, “By his *house* is meant the church of God, of his building, and where he dwells; by the *fatness* of it, the provisions there, the word and ordinances, and the blessings of grace which they hold forth.”

3. *The trunk.* This must mean the visible church of God, or the invisible church, or no church at all. If no church at all, then the Roman converts must be here addressed, as having the privilege of being engrafted into some worldly kingdom, contrary to the authority of our Lord, who said, “My kingdom is not of this world.” The Jews also are to be considered as broken off from a worldly kingdom by unbelief! whereas their unbelief, instead of breaking them off from a temporal dominion, riveted the Roman yoke more closely upon them, and made it at last the means of their destruction.

Neither can *the trunk* of this tree mean the invisible church, for from it no branches are ever broken off. This is an *argumentum ad hominem*, for I have the pleasure of quoting my Opponent’s approbation of this principle. After citing Paul on the perseverance of the saints, he says, “There is one proposition which I shall here submit; it is an universal negative, viz.

(q) Gill on John xv. 2.

(r) Ps. xxxvi. 8.

“ there never was, there never will be, a child of Adam
 “ lost, that had but one sin of all his sins forgiven him.
 “ The converse of which is, that there never was a child
 “ of Adam that had one sin forgiven him that had not
 “ all his sins forgiven. The reason is, the Almighty
 “ does not his work by halves; where he begins to work
 “ he finishes. He does not resemble a foolish artificer or
 “ mechanic, who begins a piece of workmanship, and
 “ after he has blocked it out, or begun to work upon it,
 “ throws it away, either from versatility or incapacity to
 “ execute and perfect it.”(s) It seems therefore, from my
 Opponent’s own shewing, that when a person is once at-
 tached to the invisible church, he is always attached to
 it, and can never be broken off.

As this *trunk*, then, cannot mean no church at all,
 and as it cannot mean the church invisible, it must, ac-
 cording to the dilemma stated a little while ago, mean
 the visible church. Here another inquiry arises. Does
 it mean the Jewish administration as distinct from the
 Christian? or the Christian administration as distinct
 from the Jewish? or does it mean the visible church
 general of God and of his Christ, which embraces both
 these administrations, which began with Abraham, or
 with Adam, and which will continue to the end of the
 world? This *stem* cannot mean the Jewish administra-
 tion, because it is in this very *trunk* that the engrafted
 Gentiles flourish, long after the Jewish administration is
 at an end. Neither can it mean the Christian adminis-
 tration distinctly, because the *trunk* existed long before

(s) Appendix to Spurious Debate with Mr. Walker. p. 176.

that administration commenced. But my Opponent says that “in a still more enlarged and exalted sense, the “Christian Church is the good olive tree.”(*t*) If by this still more enlarged and exalted sense, he means the visible church of Christ, as constituted with Adam or Abraham, and as embracing the Jewish and Christian administrations, he means what the premises compel us to believe. Dr. Gill says, “particular believers and “*the whole church of God* are sometimes compared to “it;” as when Hosea says, “His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the olive-tree, and his smell as Lebanon.”(*u*) Jeremiah says, “The Lord called thy “name a green olive-tree, fair and of goodly fruit: “with the noise of a great tumult he hath kindled fire “upon it, and the branches of it are broken.”(*v*)

4. *The branches.* As the *stock* of this tree has been proved to mean the whole visible church of God these *branches* must be visible constituents, either individual or corporate. Of these there are two kinds. Concerning one of them Jeremiah says “*The branches* of it are “broken.” This Dr. Gill interprets of “the high and “principal ones” of “the Jewish church and people.” Concerning the other kind of branches, Hosea says, “His “*branches* shall spread.” Dr. Gill says, “This respects “the propagation of the church of God, and the interest of Christ in the world, as in the first times of “the gospel, and will be in the latter day.” Paul

(*t*) Spur. Deb. with Mr. W. p. 28.

(*u*) Hos. xiv. 6. comp. Ps. lli. 8. cxxviii. 3.

(*v*) Jer. xi. 16. Although Gill believes that Paul alludes to this in Rom. xi. 17. he does not explain the olive-tree in either place with entire accuracy, nor in perfect consistency with what he says on Hosea xiv. 6. as quoted above.

speaks of both kinds of branches, as belonging to the same tree, though not at the same time. The first he tells us were “broken off.” The second he says were “grafted in among them,” or “in their place,” as Gill tells us the Syriac and Ethiopic versions have it. Paul expressly gives the name of *Israel* and *Jacob* to the rejected branches, and of *Gentiles* to those which were engrafted.^(w) He does not limit these branches, (as Dr. Gill sometimes does,) to the “principal members” of churches or nations: but he uses these general terms, with a general (though not a universal) application. Neither does my Opponent understand Paul as speaking of *the high and principal ones*, but of Jews and Gentiles, without regard to their dignity or power. This is evident from his remark concerning Paul’s “sudden transi-
“sitions from Jews to Gentiles,” and from his declaration that “the Apostle’s design was to shew that the
“Gentiles partook equally with the Jew, as the engraft-
“ed cion equally partakes with the natural branch, in
“the sap and vigour of the root.”^(x) This *root*, my Opponent declares, “was Jesus Christ.” Dr. Gill says, “This is not to be understood of an ingrafture into
“Christ, unless by a visible profession.” This visible profession must be in the true church of God, and, of course, the breaking off of the old Jewish branches, must be an excommunication from the visible church of God. Both, then, must be branches of the visible church of God, though at different times; and if Abraham be their ecclesiastical *father* or *root*, then the Christian

^(w) Rom. xi. 17. 25. 26.

^(x) Spur. Deb. with Mr. W. p. 28. Note, this was quoted a little above.

church must be a *branch* of the Abrahamic church : and if the Seed of the woman be their *root*, then the Jewish society before Christ, and the Christian society after Christ, are only different branches of the same ecclesiastical tree ; or, in other words, they are one and the same church in different administrations.

This conclusion is not at all affected by what Dr. Gill says about the “Gentiles being grafted into a gospel “church-state with the *believing* Jews ;” unless it can be shewn that one truth must contradict another. Remember that the old branches were not *believing* Jews ; for they were broken off on account of *unbelief*, from that very stock, into which believing Gentiles were engrafted. It is true, therefore, that there is a *simultaneous* union of believing Jews and Gentiles, both before and after Christ : but it has been proved to be equally true, that there is an *asynchronous* identity between the Jewish society before Christ, and the Christian society after Christ.

II. VINEYARD. Our blessed Lord, in one of his parables, informs us of a man who planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen, and then went into a far country, whence he sent several inferior messengers successively for the fruits which were due. Failing in these, he sent his own Son, whom the husbandmen killed. He then asks the question, “What shall therefore the Lord of the vineyard do ?” Mark well his answer : “He will come and destroy the husbandmen, “and will give the vineyard [the same vineyard] unto “others.” As the context says that the Jews “knew “that he had spoken the parable against them,” they

are therefore the husbandmen. Dr. Gill says, that when the Master went into a far country, he “left the “people of the Jews to these husbandmen or rulers, “whether civil or *ecclesiastical*, but *chiefly the latter*, “to be instructed and directed by them, according to “the laws and rules given them by the Lord.”(y) But after these Jewish husbandmen abused their trust it is said that the Lord “will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen.” On this Dr. Gill remarks that “it was “a righteous thing with God, to remove the *church-state, gospel and ordinances*, from the Jews, and deliver them to the Gentiles, which shall render him the “fruits in their seasons.”(z) Here the Baptist Commentator agrees with his Divine Master, in considering the *vineyard* as the *church* with its oracles and ordinances; and in considering the Jews as the first tenants, and the Christians as the last occupants of the same ecclesiastical vineyard.

III. FOUNDATION. “Now therefore ye are no more “strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the “saints, and of the household of God; and are built “upon the *foundation* of the Apostles and prophets, “Jesus Christ himself being the *chief corner stone*.”(a) Here the Prophets and Apostles are one common foundation, for the Jewish and Christian societies, who are supported and connected by Jesus Christ, who is the chief corner stone, or connecting foundation stone of Apostles, prophets, and churches.

(y) Gill on Mk. xii. 1.
(a) Eph. ii. 19. 20.

(z) Gill on Matt. xxi. 41.

IV. FLOOR. “Whose fan is in his hand, and he will
 “thoroughly purge his *floor*, and gather his wheat into
 “the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with un-
 “quenchable fire.”(b) “O my threshing, and the corn
 “of my *floor*!”(c) On this last text, which was spoken
 by Isaiah, Dr. Gill says, “it is the Lord that speaks
 “by him, calling the church of the Jews his *floor*, and
 “the people his corn.” If he does not intend to restrict
 “the church of the Jews,” to the Jewish administration,
 he is perfectly correct: for the *floor* does mean the visible
 church, and the corn means the Jewish people who
 were then its members. But in the fulness of time, this
 ecclesiastical floor was found so full of Jewish chaff, as
 to require a thorough cleansing. This cleansing was an
 excommunication of the unbelieving Jews. This was
 not laying a new *floor*, but only purging the old one;
 and who occupied John the Baptist’s ecclesiastical *platform*
 after its judicial ventilation, let Baptists say.

V. HOUSE. “And thou shalt say to the rebellious,
 “even to the *house* of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God,
 “O ye *house* of Israel, let it suffice you of all your
 “abominations, in that ye have brought into my sanctu-
 “ary strangers, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircum-
 “cised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it,
 “even my *house*.” “They shall be abundantly satis-
 “fied with the fatness of thy *house*.” “I am like a
 “green olive tree in the *house* of God.”(d) This, ac-
 cording to Dr. Gill, is to “be in a very flourishing con-
 “dition, in the *church of God*, which is here meant by

(b) Mat. iii. 12.

(d) Ez. xlv. 6, 7. Ps. xxxvi. 8, lii. 8.

(c) Isa. xxi. 10.

“the *house of God*.” The same explanation he gives of the word *house* in all the cases which have just been quoted. It is, then, an undoubted truth, that long before the New Testament administration, the Jewish society were the visible church of God. They were not only the genealogical, but the ecclesiastical *house of Jacob*. Now the question is, whether their ecclesiastical house was utterly annihilated, and a new one erected at the coming of Christ; or whether the ecclesiastical house of Jacob continued, but with a change of administration. That it does continue, is evident from the angel’s words to Mary, when he said concerning the Messiah, “He shall reign over the *house of Jacob*, for ever.”(e) This *house of Jacob* is meant, when Paul says, “Moses verily was faithful in all his *house* as a servant;” “but Christ as a Son over his own *house*.”(f) Now take notice that Moses and Christ are here spoken of as belonging to the Old and New Testament administrations; yet the one serves in, and the other rules over the same *house*, even the *house of Jacob*, over which Christ shall reign for ever, although Jacob’s natural descendants have long been ejected.

My Opponent’s fifth reason for denying this doctrine, is founded upon our Saviour’s declaration to Peter, “Upon this rock I *will build* my church.”(l) “This church, then,” says he, “was not the Jewish, for that was *built* long ago—the building of Christ’s church—MY church, said he, is yet *future*—I *will* build it, the foundation *will* be laid in this truth concerning

(e) Luke i. 33.

(f) Heb. iii. 2—6.

(l) Matt. xvi. 18.

“ me.—This truth was fully established in his death and
 “ resurrection ; and then the building commenced. To
 “ *build* a church and to *repair* one, are actions so dif-
 “ ferent, that babes and sucklings can distinguish them.
 “ Mr. M‘Calla’s theory is subverted upon this evidence
 “ alone, if there were no other proof of its falsity.—Re-
 “ member, my friends, that the Messiah came to *build* a
 “ new church, and not to *repair* an old one.” At ano-
 “ ther time he represents this fifth argument as drawn
 “ from the fact, that Jesus taught that he was, in the fu-
 “ ture time, to build his church upon a foundation dif-
 “ ferent from that on which the Jewish commonwealth
 “ was built.”(m)

I take it for granted, that by *Jewish commonwealth* in this last declaration, he means the Jewish church of which he spoke in the former passage ; and the amount of this argument is, that when Christ says, “ *I will build,*” he means not that he will *repair* an old ruin, such as the Jewish church, but that immediately after his death and resurrection, he will commence a building which shall be entirely new, and entirely different from the Jewish church, both as to its foundation and its superstructure. And these things he thinks so evidently taught by this one single Greek word, rendered “ *I will build,*” that they must be obvious to “babes and sucklings,” and that this one word is sufficient to subvert my proposition concerning the sameness of the Jewish and Christian societies, “if there were no other proof” at all.

It sometimes happens that babes and sucklings understand a word in one way, and men of learning understand it in another way. My Opponent thinks it perfectly plain that *to build* never means *to rebuild* or *repair*, but Dr. Gill, who was no babe, but the greatest giant, in the languages, that the Baptist church ever boasted, thought otherwise, and supported his opinion by infallible evidence. The Scriptures say that the sons of Elpaal “*built* Ono and Lod, with the towns thereof.”⁽ⁿ⁾ Dr. Gill agrees with the Talmudists in saying that “Elpaal “*came and rebuilt* them.” The Scriptures say that Jotham “*built* the higher gate of the house of the “*Lord.*”^(o) Dr. Gill believes that this, like the rest of the gates, was originally “*built by Solomon ;*” but that Jotham “*repaired* and beautified, or added something “*to it.*” Yes, the Dr. actually makes out that Jotham’s *building* the gate, was only *repairing* it. After the destruction of the first temple, it is written, “Thus saith Cyrus, King of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath “*given me all the kingdoms of the earth ; and he hath “charged me to build* him an house at Jerusalem, which “*is in Judah.*”^(p) Dr. Gill says that Isaiah’s prophecy, Cyrus “*had seen and read, and believed it to be a “charge upon him, and a command unto him to rebuild “the temple at Jerusalem.*” Thus, *to build* was, in his opinion, *to rebuild*. Concerning a greater than Cyrus, Isaiah says, “*He shall build my City.*”^(q) Dr. Gill applies this to “*Christ, the builder of the church, often compared to a city ;*” and then refers to my Opponent’s

(n) 1 Chron. viii. 12.

(h) Ezr. i. 2.

(o) 2 Kgs. xv. 35.

(q) Isa. xlv. 13.

text, "upon this rock I will build my church." "By the " church is meant," says Gill, on this text, "the elect of " God, the general assembly and church of the First-born, " whose names are written in heaven." When the Psalmist says, "The Lord *shall build up Zion*,"^(r) it does not throw Dr. Gill into a rhapsody about future tenses, and the folly of identifying Zion with the true church, and of confounding the *building* of a new house with the *rebuilding* of one that is fallen down. He tells us plainly that, in this text, Zion is "the church of God, fallen " down, and in a ruinous condition;" and that this promise to "*build up Zion*" is fulfilled "in *rebuilding* his " church." The same explanation he makes of that passage which says, "The Lord doth build up Jerusalem : " he gathereth together the outcasts of Israel."^(s) Although there is a certain sort of "babes and sucklings" who cannot abide the thought of building decayed places, yet those who are acquainted with the poetical parallelisms of the prophets, will admit that *raising up decayed places*, is sometimes exegetical of *building* ; as when God says "to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be *built*, " and I will raise up the decayed places thereof."^(t) Dr. Gill believes that Judah and all the adjacent country were to be "in a ruinous condition," and that then they "should be *rebuilt*, and restored to a flourishing state " again." To the same amount he explains the following text ; "And they shall *build* the old wastes, they " shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall " *repair* the waste cities, the desolations of many gene-

(r) Psalm cii. 16.

(s) Psalm cxlvii. 2.

(t) Isa. xlv. 26.

“ rations.”(u) In the prospect of the Christian æra, when the Gentiles were to be engrafted on the Abrahamic stock, Isaiah says to the Jews, “ The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls.”(v) But in the following passage a person who *builds* is again expressly called *a repairer* in our translation, and in this it most exactly agrees with the translations of Castallio, Tremellius, and Diodat, and with the commentary of Dr. Gill. “ And they that shall be of thee shall *build* the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations ; and thou shalt be called, *The repairer* of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in.” Dr. Gill says, “ As the cities in Israel and Judea, which had been long laid waste by the Assyrians and Chaldeans, were *rebuilt* by those of the Jewish nation, who returned from the captivity of Babylon, to which there is at least an allusion ; and as the church of God, the tabernacle of David, which was fallen down, and had lain long in ruins, through corruptions in doctrine and worship, to the times of Christ, when the Apostles, who were of the Jews, those wise master-builders, were instruments of raising it up again, and *repairing* its ruins, so, in the latter-day, *the waste places of the world*, as the words may be rendered, shall be built by a set of men, that shall be of the church of God, who shall be instruments in his hand of converting many souls, and so of peopling it with Christians ; such places as before were desolate, where before there was no preaching of the word, no administration of or-

(u) Isa. lxi. 4

(v) Isa. lx. 10.

“dinances, nor any Gospel churches.” In this extract, this great Baptist commentator calls the tabernacle of David the church of God. He represents it as fallen down and lying long in ruins, until the times of Christ, the Divine Architect, who appointed twelve Apostolical builders, and made them “instruments of raising it up “*again, and repairing* its ruins.” Thus, “the stone “which the builders disallowed, the same is made the “head of the corner,”(*w*) or, as Dr. Gill says,(*x*) “the “chief corner-stone, that adorns, strengthens, knits, and “keeps together, the whole building; in which Jews “and Gentiles, saints in all ages and places, even all the “elect of God are united together.” He says, “By the “*builders* are meant the rulers of the Jews, both civil “and ecclesiastical, and especially the latter, the “Scribes, Pharisees, and chief priests, who set up for “builders of the church of God, but were miserable “ones.” “These disallowed of Christ in the build- “ing;” “but to their great mortification, he is not only “laid and retained as the foundation and corner-stone, “but made the head of the building.” For this reason, Paul, in allusion to the temple and Jerusalem, the house and city of God, says to the Ephesian Christians, “Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreign- “ers, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the “household of God, and are built upon the foundation of “the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being “the chief corner-stone.”(*y*) Dr. Gill says that these

(*w*) 1 Pet. ii. 7.

(*x*) Gill on Acts iv. 11. (comp. also 1 Pet. ii. vi.)

(*y*) Eph. ii. 19, 20.

are “The prophets of the Old Testament, and the
 “apostles of the New, who agree in laying ministerial-
 “ly the one and only foundation, Jesus Christ.” Now
 let any reasonable person say whether the words, “upon
 “this rock I will build my church,” are alone sufficient
 to refute my proposition concerning the ecclesiastical
 identity of the Jewish and Christian societies.

VI. KINGDOM. This figure is used by our Saviour,
 in the same discourse, and in immediate connexion with
 what he said about the transfer of the same vineyard
 from one set of husbandmen to another. After speaking
 of the unworthiness of the Jewish husbandmen, in re-
 jecting the Son of their Lord; and the wicked folly of
 the Jewish builders in rejecting the chief corner-stone,
 he adds, “Therefore I say unto you, the *kingdom* of
 “God shall be taken from you, and given to a na-
 “tion bringing forth the fruits thereof.”(g) Here is
 only one kingdom; yet it embraces the Jewish and
 Christian administrations. So in the following; “And
 “I say unto you that many shall come from the east and
 “west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and
 “Jacob in the *kingdom* of heaven: but the children
 “of the *kingdom* shall be cast out into utter dark-
 “ness.”(h) This is as much as to say that the Gentiles
 shall take their seat in the Abrahamic church, while the
 Jews are cast out of it. That this cannot mean the king-
 dom of heaven above, is evident, because no man shall
 be cast out of that kingdom, after he has once obtained
 admittance. Dr. Gill says that the children of the

(g) Matt. xxi. 43.

(h) Matt. viii. 11. 12.

kingdom are “The Jews, who were subjects of the “*kingdom*, and commonwealth of Israel, from which “the Gentiles were aliens; and who were also in the “*church* of God, which is his *kingdom* on earth; and “besides, had the promise of the gospel dispensation, “sometimes called the *kingdom* of heaven, and by them, “often, the world to come; and were, by their own “profession, and in their own apprehension and expectation, children and heirs of the kingdom of glory.” The kingdom of heaven is, therefore, the Abrahamic church, the church of God. The Jews were once its children, but they are now cast out. The Gentiles were once aliens, but are now subjects, not in a new kingdom, nor in one which commenced even with Moses at Mount Sinai; but in that kingdom in which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were.

My opponent’s second argument against the sameness of the Jewish and Christian societies, is founded upon the preaching of our Saviour and his Precursor and inspired servants, “Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven “is at hand.”(v) He says, “This is proof positive that, “at this time, the new kingdom was not yet set up, “and that the old Jewish was yet standing.” In this place our translation uses, the word *kingdom*; my Opponent’s paraphrase calls it *new kingdom*; his New Testament follows Dr. Campbell in calling it the *reign* of heaven; but Dr. Campbell’s preliminary dissertation says that the word sometimes means *administration*; and Dr. Gill here explains it *dispensation*. That there

(v) Matt. iii. 2. and other places quoted by my Opponent, in his spur. Dec. after his own fashion, in page 197.

is a *new administration* I have never denied ; that there is any thing more, my Opponent is the only one to assert; and he asserts it, not in translating, but in debating.

His third argument is founded upon our Saviour's declaration, "The law and the prophets were until John : since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it."^(w) Here also Gill justly calls the *kingdom of God*, the *gospel dispensation* : and so he does the same word in the text on which my Opponent feebly rests his eighth argument ; "My kingdom is not of this world."^(x) This passage he uses in such a way as strongly to infer that the Waldenses, whom he claims as good Baptists, could not be Christians, because they sometimes bravely defended themselves from their oppressors. But this was my Opponent's way of paying court to the Quakers.

But his first argument deserves more notice. It is as follows, viz. "My first argument, for affirming that the Christian religion and Christian church differ essentially from the Jewish, is drawn from Dan. ii. 44. 45. 'And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, and it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. The great God has made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter.'⁽ⁱ⁾ To make this passage prove that there is an essential difference between the Old and New Tes-

(w) L. xvi. 16. Spur. Deb. p. 197.

(x) John xviii. 36. Spur Deb. p. 229.

(i) Spur. Deb. with me, pp. 195. 196.

tament kingdoms, he claims our particular attention to three things. One is, that the prophecy was written by Daniel, centuries before the Jews were cut off. I say, *yea*. Another is that it was to be fulfilled “hereafter,” that is, when Christ came. Very well. The third is, that at that time God should *set up* a kingdom. No objection. But there is an objection to what he afterwards says, when he endeavours to persuade you that *setting up* a kingdom is a creation or original constitution of a kingdom, as in the following words, viz. “This kingdom of God which he would *set up* or *constitute*, “under the reign of his Son, was not to commence until “the last days of the Jewish kingdom—Now to *constitute* a kingdom, and to continue one already in existence, are as different as the building of a new house, “is from the repairing or keeping up of a house already “built. To set up a house, or to set up a kingdom, is “essentially different from either reforming an old one, “or constituting it under new regulations.”

We have already shewn that the Bible and the best Baptist authority consider the word *build* as often equivalent to *rebuild* or *repair*. And if, as my Opponent intimates, the expression, *set up*, is tantamount to *build*, then to *set up* a kingdom may mean to *reinstate* or *re-establish*; and thus the whole of his argument, which rests entirely upon a perversion of this single word, must fall to the ground. In order to make this apparent, I would inquire, What do you understand from another passage of this same prophet Daniel, where we have the same original word with the same rendering? Concerning Nebuchadnezzar’s golden image, we are told “that

he *set it up* in the plain of Dura." Does this mean that he created or made or constituted it in the plain of Dura? By no means; for the manufacture of it was expressly mentioned as having taken place before its erection; (*j*) as the existence of God's ecclesiastical kingdom is often mentioned before its resuscitation by the Messiah. Although the Tabernacle was originally constituted immediately after the departure from Egypt, (*k*) yet it was *set up* at many subsequent periods. (*l*) Indeed it was a law of Moses, that "when the Tabernacle set-
 "teth forward, the Levites shall take it down; and when
 "the tabernacle is to be pitched, the Levites shall *set it*
 "*up*." (*m*) The same word is used by Solomon to denote such an act as lifting up a person who "falls from his
 "horse, or out of his carriage, or into a ditch." (*n*) In the use of the same original word, Saul complains that Jonathan had *set up* or *stirred up* David against him. (*o*) Did Saul suppose that Jonathan had just then given to David his original *constitution*? Our Bible renders the same word *raise* in application to him who is the Root and Offspring of David. "Behold the days come,
 "saith the Lord, that I will *raise* unto David a right-
 "eous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and
 "shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." (*p*) God also says, "I will *raise* them *up* a Prophet from
 "among their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put
 "my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them
 "all that I shall command him." (*q*) Had the Messiah

(*j*) Dan. iii. 1. (*k*) Ex. xl. 17. (*l*) Num. vii. 1. ix. 15. x. 21.
 (*m*) Num. i. 51. (*n*) See Gill on Eccl. iv. 10.
 (*o*) 1 Sam. xxii. 8. (*p*) Jer. xxiii. 5. (*q*) Deut. xviii. 18.

no *constitution* before his incarnation? or rather, does he not himself say, “I was *set up* from everlasting, from “the beginning, or ever the earth was.”(r) The name of this glorious personage is an answer to the question of Amos, “Who will *raise up* or *lift up*, or *set up* Jacob?”(s) The same word is rendered, *establish*, in a promise recorded by Moses. Long after Jacob had been constituted a holy people, Moses said “The Lord shall *establish* “thee an holy people unto himself.”(t) Dr. Gill understands it that he “should *continue* them as such.” Exactly to the same purport does he explain the prophecy of Daniel quoted by my Opponent. “And in “the days of those kings shall the God of heaven *set up* “a kingdom.” The Doctor says, “which kingdom is “no other than his church on earth, where he reigns, “has his throne; holds forth his sceptre, gives out his “laws, and is obeyed: and, though *this is already in the “world*, yet it is not so visible, stable, and glorious, as “it will be at the close of the fourth monarchy, which “is meant by its being *set up, confirmed, and establish- “ed*.” That this kingdom was *already in the world*, before the New Testament administration, is as evident as that the kingdom of Israel had an existence before it was *set up* or *established* in David’s hands, according to the words of Jonathan, “the kingdom of Israel shall “be *established* in thine hand.”(u)

(r) Prov. viii. 23, where, however, the original has a different word.

(s) Amos vii. 2. Gill tells us that it is rendered “quis suscitabit Jacob,” by Pagninus, Montanus, and Vatablus. To these he might have added Calasio and the Vulgate. In accordance with these, Castallio says, “quis Jacobum eriget?” and the Septuagint, *τις ανασησει τον Ιακωβ*;

(t) Deut. xxviii. 9.

(u) 1 Sam. xxiv. 20.

It appears, then, after a patient examination, that those arguments upon which my Opponent relies, are perversions of scripture ; and mere fancies of his own ; in which he is as much opposed to the views of the Colossus of Baptist theology, as he is to the view which I defend. Contrast this with the evidence by which our opinion is supported. The scriptures do not say that one ecclesiastical kingdom shall be destroyed and another created ; but they assure us that the same kingdom of God shall be taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles. Concerning the same kingdom of heaven it is said that the Jews shall be cast out, while the Gentiles shall enter and sit down : neither are they restricted to the honor of sitting with Moses and Aaron and Joshua, but they are admitted to a seat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, in this ecclesiastical *kingdom*, or Abrahamic church.

VII. COMMONWEALTH. Paul tells the Ephesians that they were once “ Aliens from the *commonwealth* of Israel ;” but he soon informs them that they “ are no more *strangers* and *foreigners*, but *fellow citizens* with the saints, and of the household of God.” (y) Dr. Gill tells us that *a stranger* was the name “ by which the Jews called the Gentiles ;” that the Gentiles were originally “ *foreigners* in the *commonwealth* of Israel, in the *church of God* ;” “ being aliens from the *commonwealth* of Israel, both from their civil and *church-state*.” That the city in which they become fellow citizens with the saints is “ the church

“below, which is the city of God,” and “heaven above, which is a city of God’s preparation and building also.” In this most valuable Baptist Commentary, we learn that the *commonwealth of Israel* means the church of God, to which the Jews once belonged, and from which the Gentiles were once strangers and foreigners: but the New Testament administration has naturalized them in the city of God, which is his church below, even that church of which the Jews were once members.

VIII. MAN. “But now, in Christ Jesus, ye [Gentiles] who sometimes were far off, are made nigh [even as the Jews,] by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both [Jews and Gentiles] *one*, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain *one* new *man*, so making peace.”(z)

IX. BODY. “And that he might reconcile both [Jews and Gentiles] unto God in one *body* by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.”(a) The connexion of this and the last particular, and the 7th also, shews that *man* and *body*, as well as *commonwealth*, relate to the visible church. It is not said that they relate to that exclusively; nor is it necessary that they should.

X. BRETHREN. In Ps. xxii. 22, Christ calls the Jewish church his *brethren*: in Hebr. ii. 11. 12, this is quoted as intended for Christians. They must there-

(z) Eph. ii. 13—15.

(a) Eph. ii. 16.

fore be one in some sense. The connexion shews that they are ecclesiastically one.

XI. BRIDE. Jeremiah says that Jehovah is married to the Jewish church ;(b) John tells us that the Christian church is the *bride*, the Lamb's *wife* ;(c) yet God says, by the pen of Solomon, " My dove, my undefiled, " is but *one* ; she is the only *one* of her mother ; she is " the choice *one* of her that bare her."(d) It seems then that Christ has but *one* bride or church ; but the Jewish and Christian societies are both that church ; therefore they are *one* church. That this passage relates to ecclesiastical unity, Gill himself is inclined to believe.

XII. CHILDREN. The scriptures represent Jewish and Gentile professors as the children of the church. When the Jews are cut off, the church is represented as a widow : but she is comforted by the accession of Gentile children. " The [Gentile] *children* which thou " shalt have, after thou hast lost the other [the Jewish], " shall say again in thine ears, the place is too strait for " me : give place to me that I may dwell. Then shalt " thou say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these, " seeing I have lost my *children*, and am desolate, a captive, and removing to and fro ? and who hath brought " up these ? Behold I was left alone ; these, where had " they been ? Thus saith the Lord God, behold, I will " lift up mine hand to the *Gentiles*, and set up my stand- " ard to the people : and they shall bring thy *sons* in " their arms, and thy *daughters* shall be carried upon " their shoulders."(e) Some who admit the identity of

(b) Jer. iii. 14.

(d) Cant. vi. 9.

(c) Rev. xxi. 9.

(e) Isa. xlix. 20—22.

the Jewish and Christian societies are inclined to doubt that the former is intended by either of these classes of children. Their mistake ought to be corrected by the preceding context, in which "*Zion* said, The Lord "hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me." Messiah says, "Though *Israel* be not gathered, yet "shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my "God shall be my strength." The Father says to him, "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant, "to raise up the tribes of *Jacob*, and to restore the pre- "served of *Israel*; I will also give thee for a light to the "Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the "end of the earth."^(f) I do not deny that the ultimate accomplishment of these prophecies is yet future: yet that their primary fulfilment was in the Apostolic day, is too plain to admit of a doubt. Can any one suppose that *Zion*, *Jacob*, and *Israel*, have no reference to the *Jews*, even when they are expressly contrasted with the *Gentiles*? Here, then, are two distinct sets of ecclesiastical children, sent before and after the affliction of their mother; just as Job had two sets of children sent before and after his affliction. These Patriarchal *decades* form a good illustration of the subject, and were probably intended to do so; and this opinion may have weighed with the Jews in considering the number ten as forming a congregation. But Job's two congregations had only one father, and thus formed one family: so the Jews and Gentiles had only one ecclesiastical mother; that is, they were one church.

(f) Isa. xlix. 14. 5. 6.

If not very much mistaken, the evidence which has been laid before you, goes clearly to the establishment of the point in question; that is, that the Scriptures give to the Jewish and Christian Societies the same *names*, in such a manner as plainly to prove that they are the same church. This evidence my Opponent endeavours to rebut in the following words, viz. “Mr. M‘Calla (for “we must now look back a little,) yesterday entertained “you for a long time, by telling you of the different “names applied to the Jewish society, and also to the “Christian, as expressive of their identity; as their being equally called the house, bride, people, vineyard, “kingdom, &c. of God. To all this argument we would “in the mass reply. That suppose I might be so fortunate as to have a house in Washington and one in Lexington, each of them might with the greatest propriety “be called my house; the same might be said concerning “barn, vineyard, floor, kingdom, &c. But who would “argue thence that because they were both called my “house, vineyard, barn, &c. they were one and the same “house, vineyard, barn, &c. This would shock common “sense. But it may be objected that the Lord, metaphorically speaking, had but one bride, that he could “not be said to have had two. To such an objection I “would reply by saying that he always had but one “bride, one house, one vineyard, one kingdom, &c. at “one time; but that Israel having broken the marriage “covenant was divorced, and ceased to be his married

“ wife, in the metaphorical style ; and that in their stead
 “ another bride was chosen, another house was built,
 “ another vineyard was planted, another kingdom was
 “ constituted, to which the same figurative names were
 “ applied. And after all that Mr. M‘Calla has said on
 “ this subject, it amounts to precisely the same thing ;
 “ for he will not say, with all his fortitude and zeal, he
 “ cannot say, that the Jewish and Christian societies are
 “ identically the very same—no, he will say, he has
 “ said, they are under different dispensations, and this
 “ is saying a great deal, if he is aware of the import of
 “ it, for, in fact, a different dispensation is tantamount to
 “ a different covenant. At all events, he makes the two
 “ societies different in some respects, and thus esta-
 “ blishes my views and saps the very basis of his own
 “ system.”(g)

The question whether the two societies are under different covenants or not, will, with divine permission, soon be tried. It is true that a difference of administration, and a difference in many other respects, has been admitted. I never undertook to prove their personal or political, their chronological or geographical identity. In my explication of the *2d proposition*, I expressly declared that “it says nothing more than that
 “ they are the *same church*, and nothing more than ec-
 “ *clesiastical identity* is intended.” While this can be shewn, they may differ in ten thousand respects, without sapping the foundation of my system. But if I mistake not, my Opponent considers his own system not perfect-

ly tenable, as he has changed it to meet the present emergency. He would now make you believe that it "amounts to precisely the same thing" with what I have said; except that instead of the Jews and Christians being one and the same church, they are two essentially different churches, but one has come in the stead of the other. He says that the great Head of the church "always had but one bride" "at one time; but that Israel having broken the marriage covenant, was divorced," "and that in their stead another bride was chosen, another house was built," &c. Has he not at last admitted the truth of my first proposition that the Jews were once the visible church of God? But where does he find evidence that this church was destroyed, and a perfectly new one instituted? How does he prove what he has said on this subject, that "another vineyard was planted, another kingdom was constituted," "another bride was chosen, another house was built?" What Scripture has he quoted to shew that the Jewish church was as different from the Christian, as a house in Washington is different from a house in Lexington? It is evident that nothing but the sad necessities of the times have driven him to this flimsy subterfuge. According to this theory, can we believe that the Messiah shall reign over the house of Jacob forever? The house over which he now reigns must be essentially different, in all respects, from the house of Jacob. It must also be built upon the foundation of the Apostles only, and not "upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets," as Paul has declared. We must moreover give up the doctrine of John the Baptist, that the Messiah "will tho-

roughly *purge* his floor.” My Opponent teaches that he does not cleanse his floor, but that he destroys it, and lays a new one, as different from it, as two floors in Washington and Lexington are different from each other. It may be that some Baptist farmer in this assembly is sufficiently prejudiced to believe this exposition. It may be also that when you came to this debate you left to your servants a barn floor full of wheat, with directions to clean it well before your return. What would you think if they should set fire to the barn instead of to the chaff? Would you not say that there was a great difference between cleaning a floor and destroying it? If some tidy housewives were to destroy their floors as often as they clean them, they would keep the carpenters busy. Suppose that you have let out your farm or vineyard to tenants who will pay no rent. You send officers to eject them. Instead of this, these officers destroy the vineyard and leave you to plant a new one near Lexington, according to my Opponent’s doctrine. Would this be in accordance with the text which says, “He will destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others?” My Opponent teaches that the kingdom of God was not taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles; but that the Jewish *kingdom* was destroyed, and “another kingdom was constituted” for the Gentiles. Compare this with the words of the King. “Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.” According to my Opponent’s theory, the Head of the church “had but one bride” “at one time;” but different brides at different times. So the Jews were one *man* and one *body*, but the Christians ano-

ther *man* and another *body* essentially different. But the Spirit says that this bride “is the only one of her mother:” and concerning the Jews and Gentiles, it declares that Christ hath made “in himself of twain *one* new “*man* ;” and that he hath reconciled “both unto God “in *one body*.” When they are called children, it is not said, as my Opponent would have it, that the Jewish children had one mother, and the Gentile children had another mother essentially different, like two mothers in Washington and Lexington ; but the same mother who lost the Jewish children is represented as obtaining comfort from the birth of her Gentile children. You do not find it said, that the Jews were one olive-tree, from which certain branches were broken off, and the Gentiles another olive-tree, into which other branches were engrafted ; but the Gentile branches are engrafted into the same olive-tree from which the Jewish branches were broken off. How different this from two olive-trees in Washington and Lexington !

We conclude, therefore, that if the fact that the scriptures call the Jewish and Christian societies the same peculiar treasure and priest-hood, nation and people, the same ecclesiastical tree and vineyard, kingdom and commonwealth, the same foundation, floor, and house, the same man and body, brethren, bride, and mother, and if an express declaration of unity, as in several instances just quoted, will prove them to be the same church, then their ecclesiastical identity has been proved.

POINT III.

The Jewish and Christian societies must be the same church, because they have the same CONSTITUTION, the Abrahamic COVENANT.

On this subject, my Opponent has spoken as follows, viz. “Mr. M’Calla has asserted that the covenant or
 “ constitution of both churches is one and the same ;
 “ that this covenant is the Abrahamic, and that this
 “ Abrahamic covenant was an ‘ecclesiastical covenant.’
 “ Circuitous and intricate are the paths of error. What
 “ a labor, what a toil to establish infant-membership.
 “ The Rev. Samuel Rallston, it seems, borrowed this
 “ ecclesiastical covenant from Dr. John Mason, and
 “ Mr. M’Calla appears to have borrowed it from Fa-
 “ ther Rallston. What a valuable acquisition! How
 “ much more are we indebted to philosophical di-
 “ vines for their discoveries, than to the Spirit of
 “ revelation that guided the tongues and the pens of the
 “ holy Apostles! The old and the new covenant
 “ were the covenants on which the Apostles wrote
 “ and talked. They, poor, simple, and unlettered men,
 “ never used such phrases as the covenant of works, the
 “ covenant of grace, the ecclesiastic covenant. No, it
 “ was reserved to the age of reason, to unfold the cov-
 “ enant of works and of grace ; and, to the last centu-
 “ ry, together with the urgent demands of infant-
 “ sprinkling, are we indebted for this last discovery,
 “ this ecclesiastic covenant. But where this covenant
 “ may be found, my Antagonist has not condescended
 “ to inform us. We shall then, as a favour, request him

“ to specify where this covenant may be found. Is it
 “ in the 12th, 15th, or 17th Chapter of Genesis? Till
 “ then we must merely conjecture. In our Appendix to
 “ the Debate at Mount Pleasant, we were somewhat
 “ particular in fixing the meaning of the term *covenant*
 “ as used in the holy scripture. Mr. M‘Calla, so
 “ often as has referred to that Debate, has not called in
 “ question the facts there stated. The term *diatheke*
 “ is there exhibited as signifying, either *appointment*,
 “ *constitution*, *covenant*, or *testament*, and it is there
 “ proven from matter of fact, that *promises* and *com-*
 “ *mands* are called covenants.”(h)

Thus far, my Baptist Opponent. I confess myself attached to the old-fashioned technical theology. That it was the fruit of much *labour* and *toil*, as my Opponent has insinuated, cannot be denied. Our Fathers were addicted to prayers and pains, and, at the same time, gifted with piety and parts, very far beyond that superficial race of apostates which have learned to despise their attainments. Some of this motley brood deny that there is a covenant of works or a covenant of grace, and others deny that the original words ever signify a covenant between God and man at all, and say that our Translators have been guilty of encouraging “ a very erroneous and “ dangerous opinion,” by using the word *covenant* in such a connexion. Such extravagant folly as this, my Opponent is not now willing to avow. He admits that the original words are properly translated, *testament*, *constitution*, *covenant* ; although they may sometimes

signify an *appointment, command, or law*. Between these two there is no more discrepancy, than there is in saying with one breath that the *constitution* of the United States is the supreme *law* of the land, and with another breath, that it is our great political *covenant* or *federal compact*.

My Opponent speaks of our ecclesiastical covenant as a novelty. I boast no new discoveries of my own, nor am I conscious of following any novelty of the last or of the present century, on this subject. An enlightened and candid examination of the seventh chapter of the Westminster Confession, and the scriptures there referred to, ought to convince any one, not only that the covenant of works, and the covenant of grace were held by the Puritans and by the Apostles, but that both the Reformed Presbyterians and the Primitive Christians believed that the Abrahamic covenant was an *ecclesiastical exhibition* of the covenant of grace, differently administered, in the Old and New Testament dispensations; and of course different from the Sinaitic covenant which has vanished long ago.

When my Opponent calls upon me so loudly and so frequently to point out that particular chapter in Genesis to which I refer as containing the covenant with Abraham, I wish him to understand that I refer to all the chapters which he has specified, and to every other in which any part of the Abrahamic covenant is contained. The opinion that all these passages record the same covenant appears to be founded on inspired authority. The scriptures say “Ye are the children of the *covenant*” which God made with our Fathers, saying unto Abra-

“ham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.” “For the Lord thy God is a merciful God; he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the *covenant* of thy fathers, which he sware unto them.” “To remember his holy *covenant*, the oath which he sware to our Father Abraham.” “I sware unto thee, and entered into a *covenant* with thee, saith the Lord God.” “Remember, break not thy *covenant* with us.”(i)

Against this familiar language of scripture, in which only one Abrahamic *covenant* is mentioned, my Opponent quotes one or two instances in which Paul speaks of *covenants*, without intimating that they were Abrahamic covenants. “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the *covenants*, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.”(j) Although “some copies, and the Vulgate Latin and Ethiopic versions, read *the covenant*,” in the singular number instead of the plural, it is evident that the common is the correct reading. But why must we believe all these covenants to have been made with Abraham? Dr. Macknight, whose version my Opponent professes to copy, in his New Testament, calls these “*the two covenants*,” “the covenant with Abraham,” “and the covenant at Sinai.” Some suppose them to mean the two testaments: but Dr. Gill says that these covenants are “not the two Testaments, Old and New, but the

(i) Acts iii. 25. Deut. iv. 31. Luke i. 72. 73. Ez. xvi. 8. Jer. xiv. 21.

(j) Rom. ix. 4. in Spur. Deb. p. 175.

“covenant of circumcision, made with Abraham their father, and the covenant at Sinai, they entered into with the Lord.” But my Opponent says, “Besides, and prior to the covenant at Sinai, there was a plurality of covenants;” and he connects these covenants with the fathers, in a manner quite too ingenious for me to imitate. He does it by altering the text, in such a manner as to give it a meaning different from the Original, and from his own *Incomparable* New Testament, and from every other translation. The following is given by him, as the word of God, in Rom. ix. 4. “Who are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption and the giving of the law and the covenants, whose are also the fathers.” In his New Testament, *the covenants*, are separated from *the fathers*, by a dozen words, three commas, and one semicolon; all of which he has here *suppressed*, except one expression, “the giving of the law,” which he has put out of the way by *transposition*, in order that he may connect the *covenants* with the *fathers*, which he attempts to do more effectually by *interpolating* the word *also*. This *alteration*, however, is not much more outrageous, than one contained in his book against Mr. Walker, where he puts “*by the Father*,” instead of, “*to our Fathers*,” in Luke i. 72.(k) If he cannot prove a plurality of covenants with Abraham without making scripture for the purpose, you will probably believe that he cannot prove it all.

But in the text under consideration, my Opponent says that “the giving of the law” means “the covenant

(k) Spur. Deb against Mr. W. p. 159.

at Horeb," or the Sinaitic covenant, and therefore "the covenants" mentioned along with it, cannot mean the same thing. This, however, is an assertion, not only without proof, but in opposition to proof. The Greek word here used for "the giving of the law," either signifies *the right of giving law*, or *the act of giving law*, or *the law itself*. As it is said to pertain to the Israelites, it cannot signify *the right of giving law*; as it pertained to Paul's contemporaries, it cannot mean *the act of giving law*; it must therefore mean *the law itself*. Kype remarks that "by νομοθεσια is here to be understood, "not so much *the promulgation of the law*, which belonged only to the Mosaic age, as *the law itself*, i. e. *the whole system of his law*." "And he shews," says Parkhurst, "that this is not an unusual sense of "νομοθεσια."

The other instance quoted by my Opponent for a plurality, of Abrahamic covenants, is where Paul tells the Ephesians that they were once "strangers from the covenants of promise." Whether or not this is a Hebraism, in which the plural is used for the singular, need not here be discussed. Dr. Gill says that this refers "to "the covenant of circumcision given to Abraham; and "to the covenant at Mount Sinai, made with Israel; "and to the dispensation of the covenant of grace to that "people, sometimes called the first covenant and the old "covenant, and which peculiarly belonged to them, "Rom. ix. 4. One copy reads, *strangers to the promises of the covenant*; which is natural enough."(1)

(1) Gill on Eph. ii. 12. See Spur. Deb. with me, p. 183.

“ But,” says my Opponent, “ we have shewn that
 “ there were different covenants made with Abraham,
 “ distinct in their nature, time, place, and circum-
 “ stances. One was made with him, Gen. xii. when 75
 “ years old, in Haran : this was 430 years before the co-
 “ venant at Sinai. This is called by the Apostle, Gal.
 “ iii. 17, *the covenant confirmed concerning Christ*, as
 “ Macknight renders it. This covenant was afterward
 “ confirmed by an oath, Gen. xxii. when Abraham of-
 “ fered up his son upon the altar. Eight years after this
 “ covenant, Gen. xv. God ‘ MADE A COVENANT’
 “ with Abraham, in the most formal manner, concern-
 “ ing Canaan. Sixteen years after this time, (Gen. xvii.)
 “ he makes another covenant, called by Stephen the
 “ ‘ *covenant of circumcision.*’ Yet you were gravely told
 “ that there was but one covenant made with Abraham ;
 “ and this an ecclesiastic covenant. Yet there is no
 “ *church*, no *ecclesia* mentioned in it, nor for hundreds
 “ of years afterwards. What a daring spirit does infant-
 “ sprinkling inspire ! Covenants made in different coun-
 “ tries, and at the intervals of eight, sixteen, and twen-
 “ ty-four years, it calls *one !*” (m)

This rhapsody of my Baptist Opponent considers the number of the Abrahamic covenants as plain as the noon-day. They must be three, exactly three ; and this is so obvious and so important, that nothing but the daring spirit of error will ever doubt it. Yet in another case my Opponent himself seems to doubt whether “ we should say there were *three* covenants, or only *two*

(m) Spur. Deb. with me, p. 183.

“covenants made with Abraham.” At that time he could not make out the number *three* without adding the Sinaitic covenant, which was not made with Abraham, but with Moses. The following are his words, viz. “The Scriptures on this subject are very plain. They speak of a plurality of covenants belonging to the Jews. There was the covenant ‘confirmed of God in relation to Christ,’ 430 years before the giving of the law ; and there was the covenant of circumcision, 24 years after the former. There was the covenant at Horeb, 430 years after the covenant confirmed of God in relation to Christ. Here are *three* covenants. The latter Mr. M’Calla has discarded as that covenant on which the Christian church is founded, but which of the *two* former is his ecclesiastical covenant he saith not.(n)

If my Opponent has found only *two* Abrahamic covenants after all, you must not be surprised if I can find only *one* ; especially if I am supported in this opinion by the Bible and by Baptist authority. He has said much about these *two* alledged covenants being 24 years apart, the first in Gen. xii. in the year Before Christ 1921 ; the second in Gen xvii. in the year 1897 Before Christ. His book against Mr. Walker contains some pompous chronological trifling on this subject, in which he appeals to a table at the end of Johnson’s Dictionary. Thinking it probable that Dr. Allison, the Baptist preacher, had the same or a similar chronological table at the end of his English Dictionary, I consulted it, and

(n) Spur. Deb. with me, pp. 174. 175.

found the following items in relation to the 12th and 17th chapters of Genesis. They are as follows, viz :

“1921. The covenant made by God with Abram, when the 430 years of sojourning commenced.

1897. The covenant renewed with Abram ; his name changed to Abraham ; circumcision instituted.”

So far are these two places from recording different covenants, that the covenant with Isaac, and the covenant with Jacob, are only the same *one* Abrahamic covenant *renewed*, as Dr. Allison expresses it. David says “He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word “which he commanded to a thousand generations: “which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath “unto Isaac ; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a “law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant.” As a reason for its being everlasting, Dr. Gill says that “being “remembered, commanded, repeated, and confirmed, “it can never be broken.”(o) To shew that he sometimes(p) thought Gen. xii. xvii. and xxii. to contain only this *one* Abrahamic covenant, “commanded, repeated, and confirmed,” he expressly refers to these chapters in his exposition of this passage, and then requests the reader to compare with them Luke i. 72. 73. “To “perform the mercy promised to our Fathers, and to “remember his holy covenant, the oath which he swore “to our father Abraham.” When the Psalmist says, “Have respect unto the covenant,” Gill says that this means “not the covenant of works,” “but the covenant “of grace, made with Christ before the world was,

(o) Gill on Ps. cv. 8—10.

(p) Dr. Gill sometimes considers these as distinct covenants.

“and made manifest to Adam, to Noah, to Abraham, “ Isaac, and Jacob, to David, and others.”(q)

Much of my Opponent's opposition to the *oneness* of the Abrahamic covenant, rests upon the untenable position, that all the parts and appendages of a constitution must be drafted and published at the same moment ; that it is annulled by any subsequent enlargement or amendment ; that distant and different editions destroy its integrity ; that every such edition, especially if accompanied with additions, even verbal or circumstantial, makes it essentially a new constitution. But if this be correct, we shall have to believe that God made *eight* covenants with Abraham, instead of *two* or *three*. “ He certainly appeared to him, and addressed him in “ covenant language, at eight different times. Nor is “ there any thing in the subjects on which he addressed “ him, which would lead us to fix on two covenants, “ rather than eight. Those, therefore, who do not be- “ lieve that he made *eight distinct covenants*, with him “ have no reason to suppose that he made with him more “ than *one*.”(r) The same criterion should lead its advocates to believe that there have been half as many constitutions of the United States. Our political covenant, as proposed by the Convention, in 1797, had seven articles. The first Congress, at its first session, proposed ten additional articles. The eleventh article was proposed by the first session of the third Congress, and the twelfth by the first session of the eighth Con-

(q) Ps. lxxiv, 20.

(r) Pond's Reply to Judson. p. 74. He refers to Gen. xji. 1. and 7. xiii. 14. xv. 1. xvii. xviii. xxi. 12. and xxii. 15.

gress. All these articles now form one and the same constitution, yet as drafted and adopted at four different times, and published in distant and different editions. Neither would its *oneness* be at all affected, if a thirteenth article were now added, appointing a governmental seal, or altering the seal now in use, as circumcision was added as a seal to the Abrahamic covenant, twenty-four years after its alledged origin, and as this seal was altered to baptism, near two thousand years after that period.

The two titles which the New Testament gives to the Abrahamic covenant, make a delightful subject of declamation for my Opponent. Stephen calls it "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ;" and Paul calls it "the covenant of circumcision."^(s) When Stephen says that it "was confirmed before," he means before "the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after." Here my Opponent sets all his chronological apparatus to work, to shew that this 430 years before the law, will take us back, not to Gen. xvii. when circumcision was instituted, but to Gen. xii. to "the ever-memorable charter of all the blessings which Jewish and Gentile believers enjoy through Christ;" as a certain Baptist writer styles this first publication of the Abrahamic covenant. But mark well a distinction between the *promulgation* and the *confirmation* of this "covenant confirmed." The *promulgation* may be in Gen. xii. and this may be 430 years before the law: but that the *confirmation* is in this

(s) Acts vii. 8. Gal. iii. 17.

chapter or at this date, is not asserted by Stephen, nor, (I believe,) by the Baptists themselves. My Opponent, in a passage already quoted, instead of referring to Gen. xii. sends us to Gen. xxii. for this *confirmation*. His words are "This covenant was afterwards "*confirmed* by an oath, Gen. xxii. when Abraham "offered up his son upon the Altar."(*t*) Dr. Gill does not believe that Stephen refers to Gen xii. for one thing or another, but that his mention of the covenant is to be understood, "of a peculiar confirmation of it to "Abraham, either by a frequent repetition thereof, or "by annexing an oath unto it; or rather, by those rites "and usages, and even wonderful appearances, recorded in Gen. xv. 9. 10. 12. 13. 17. 18, and which "was *four hundred and thirty years* before the law was "given, which are thus computed by the learned "Pareus." He then gives us the computation of Pareus.

My Opponent looks for the *confirmation* in Gen. xxii. Dr. Gill looks for it in Gen. xv. one on each side of Gen. xvii. where it is really to be found. Circumcision gives this seventeenth chapter a repulsive aspect. It resembles many a mud-hole in the road from Washington to Lexington. The way of safety lies right through it: but a span of horses will try hard to go one on each side of it. There is Dr. Gill, with the chronological traces of Pareus, pulling hard to the left; Here is my Opponent, with his chronological harness, tugging and slipping and floundering toward the right. But it will not

(*t*) Spur. Deb. with mc. p. 183.

all do; the middle is the road, and through it the church will go.

Dr. Gill is that reasonable sort of a man who is apt to make a poor advocate for a bad cause; because he admits enough of the truth to refute his own errors. In the extract just now given, he admits a frequent repetition of the covenant to Abraham. While he allows, with my Opponent, that it may be confirmed by an oath, he admits that it is confirmed, “*rather by those rites and usages, and even wonderful appearances recorded in Gen. xv.*” Perhaps you think that he will, at no time, admit circumcision among those *rites and usages* by which the Abrahamic covenant was confirmed. If so, you are mistaken. On the New Testament he tells us “that circumcision was a seal, not for secresy, but “for certainty; it being a *confirmation* not only of the “sincerity of Abraham’s faith, but of his justifying “righteousness, which was not his faith, but that “which his faith looked to.”(u) Even in Gen. xvii. 7, when God says, “I will *establish* my covenant between “me and thee,” Gill explains this as a declaration that he will “not only *renew* it, but *confirm* it by the follow- “ing token of circumcision.” Thus it appears that the covenant of circumcision was not a new one, but a *renewal* of a former one, with the addition of a seal by which it was *confirmed* of God in Christ, to whose righteousness Abraham’s faith looked, when “he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircum-

(u) Rom. iv. 7.

“cised.” There is, in truth, no more difference between the covenant of circumcision and the covenant of confirmation, than there is between our great political compact and our federal constitution. They mean the same covenant as certainly as that *the scriptures* and *the bible* mean the same book.

All parties appear to agree that the promises of Gen. xii. contemplate spiritual blessings, and are given to Abraham’s spiritual seed: but my Opponent, in his book against Mr. Walker,^(v) assures us that the promises in Gen. xvii. are confined to Abraham’s natural descendants, and to temporal blessings. To do entire justice to the subject, it may not be amiss to institute a brief inquiry concerning the persons and things contemplated in both places.

I. *The persons.* The proof given by the Baptists, that Gen. xii. was in behalf of Abraham’s spiritual seed, is found in the following words of the third verse; “and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” Now let us see whether there is not something like this in the seventeenth chapter. In the 2nd verse, God promises that he “will multiply thee exceedingly.” Gill says that “this may include his natural seed by her [Sarah], and his spiritual seed among all nations, who “are of the same faith with him, see ch. xii. 2, and “xiii. 16, and xv. 5.” Here the Dr. expressly refers to the 12th chapter as containing promises co-extensive with those of this chapter. But read on. Gen. xvii. 4, says, “Thou shalt be a father of many nations.”

After enumerating the many nations naturally descended from Abraham, Gill says, "and, in a spiritual sense, " the father of all that believe, in all the nations of the " world, circumcised or uncircumcised, as the Apostle " explains it, Rom. iv. 11. 12. 16. 17. 18." The 5th verse says, " thy name shall be Abraham," which Gill interprets " the father of a numerous offspring; " and with this agrees the reason of it as follows; '*for " " a father of many nations have I made thee:*' " on which he says, " Abraham has not only been the father " of many nations, in a literal sense, as before observed, " but in a mystical sense, of the whole world; that is, " of all in it that believe, whether Jews or Gentiles." Verse 6th says, "and kings shall come out of thee." Gill's remarks on this are closed with the following words, viz. "... the king Messiah: to which may be added, in " a mystical sense, all Christian kings and princes of the " same faith with him; nay, all believers, who are all " kings and priests unto God." The 7th verse says, " And I will establish my covenant between me and " thee." Gill says, "Not only *renew* it, but *confirm* " it by the following token of circumcision." The same verse adds, " and thy seed after thee in their genera- " tion, for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto " thee, and to thy seed after thee:" in commenting upon which, Gill thrice declares that the promise is to " his spiritual seed." Here we have the greatest Baptist Commentator producing abundant inspired evidence that the covenant promises of Gen. xvii. are not only to Abraham's natural, but to his *spiritual* seed also.

II. *The blessings.* Are they spiritual, or are they

temporal only? My Opponent says that they are the latter; for which he gives five reasons.(w)

1. "That they should be a numerous and powerful people." But the same promise is contained in Gen. xii. 2, which is confessedly spiritual; and the same is repeatedly made to the church militant, and even to the church triumphant, after all temporal things have ceased.

2. "That they should inherit the land of Canaan for a perpetual possession." It is true that this is a temporal blessing; but let it be remembered, that, as Dr. Gill observes, it is one "which was a figure of the heavenly inheritance, which is an eternal one, and will be enjoyed by all his spiritual seed, to all eternity." It is on this principle that my Opponent has followed Dr. George Campbell in translating our Saviour's words, "Happy the meek, for they shall inherit the land;"(x) meaning the land of Canaan, here used as a figure, referring not only to temporal, but "to eternal benefits," as Dr. Campbell expressly declares in his note on the place. Thus did Paul view this promise to Abraham when he says, "By *faith* he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles, with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise; for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."(y)

3. You will, no doubt, be astonished to hear that the ground of my Opponent's third reason is, that in the 7th

(w) Spur. Deb. with Mr. W. p. 160.

(y) Hebr. xi. 9. 10.

(x) Matt. v. 5.

verse God promises “to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee;” and in the eighth verse he says, “I will be their God.” In the 7th verse Gill believes that his Maker enters into covenant with Abraham’s “spiritual seed, as the God of all grace, supplying them with grace here, and bestowing upon them glory hereafter.” The eighth verse he explains in a similar manner.

4. “It was conditional.” This assertion my Opponent endeavours to support, by saying “See Gen. xvii. throughout.” But fearing that this would not answer, he quotes “and the uncircumcised man-child....he hath broken my covenant:” that is, says Dr. Gill “made it null and void, neglecting the token of it, circumcision.” As this does not appear sufficient, my Opponent tacks to it, as belonging to the same chapter, the following words of Isaiah, viz. “If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land.” The next verse adds, “but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword.”(z) This may do very well to shew the character of the Sinaitic covenant; for it is almost transcribed from Leviticus xxvi. which Gill declares related to “the covenant made with them at Sinai.”(a) My Opponent may excuse his disingenuousness, by recurring to a pretended amalgamation of these two covenants. I hope soon to shew you, with the help of heaven, that this also is a fiction.

5. “It was a covenant *in the flesh* and not *in the spirit*. ‘My covenant shall be in your flesh,’ Gen.

(z) Is. i. 19. 20.

(a) Lev. xxvi. 3. 4. 14. 17. The mention of the covenant is in verse 15.

“ xvii. 13. The rite of circumcision was the seal of this covenant.”!!!! What an admirable argument!! Well may its author boast of his “critical accumen,” and his “respectability as a scholar.” We have been accustomed to thinking that the expression, “My covenant shall be in your flesh,” meant, that circumcision, the seal or token of the covenant, should be in the flesh, while the thing signified by it might, nevertheless be in the spirit, according to an express promise that “the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed.”(b) So we have always thought that the application of baptism to the *body* did not exclude the answer of a good *conscience*: but my Opponent has discovered that an application of the sacerdotal knife, or of the baptismal water to the body, proves that the covenant with which they are connected is wholly temporal, and has no relation to spiritual blessings at all! According to Dr. Gill, however, “circumcision was a typical sign of Christ, as all the ceremonies of the law were, and of the shedding of his blood, to cleanse from all sin, original and actual, and also of the circumcision of the heart; and was more-over a seal of the righteousness of faith.”(c)

That you may feel a proper interest in this discussion, it is necessary to keep in mind the reason, why there has been such a waste of industry and ingenuity, in endeavouring to debase and destroy the holy ordinance of

(b) Deut. xxx. 6.

(c) Gill on Rom. iv. 11. In relation to this subject, the Doctor's opposition to Pedobaptism makes him sometimes speak in such a manner as to contradict himself, and to reject truths which he, at other times, admits.

circumcision. If the substance of this ordinance be permitted to continue as the seal of a permanent covenant, my Opponent knows that it can be found no where in the Christian church, except in the form of baptism. If baptism, therefore, be the Christian circumcision, as it was considered by the Apostles and primitive Christians, then it must, like the Jewish circumcision, be administered to believers and their households. Here would be infant baptism at once ; and all this, on account of circumcision, that obnoxious institution. To avoid this he must destroy circumcision both in its form and substance. But this cannot be done without destroying the covenant of which it is a seal. To accomplish this they must either deny the perpetuity of the one Abrahamic covenant, which they are not prepared to do, or they must find two Abrahamic covenants, one of which may lay exclusive claims to circumcision, and be destroyed with it. Because circumcision is found in Gen. xvii. that chapter is marked for destruction, as containing a covenant which is temporary in its duration, and temporal in its benefits, and essentially different from the covenant which is recorded before and after it. But this plurality of Abrahamic covenants is not only unknown to the inspired writers, but is, as we have shewn, in direct opposition to their repeated declarations, both in the Old and New Testaments : and so far is Gen. xvii. from containing a temporary covenant with temporal benefits, that its evidence of spirituality and perpetuity is more abundant than that of any other publication of the Abrahamic covenant in the whole book. To an unprejudiced mind, it is plain, that the covenant which

was published and repeated in the twelfth and fifteenth chapters, was ratified or established, or, as Dr. Gill explains it, *renewed* and *confirmed*, in the seventeenth, where circumcision was given as a seal.

Even those who make this latter a distinct and destructible covenant, have to give it entirely a new name, before they can find any Scripture that will put it to death. There is not a word in the bible, for destroying any Abrahamic covenant: they are obliged, therefore, to call it the Sinaitic covenant, or the covenant of Horeb. Ask my Opponent how it obtained this new name, and he will tell you that it was by *amalgamation*. Yes, it was not by inspiration, but by a process unknown to the Scriptures, or the ancient church; a *federal amalgamation*, elaborated in the flimsy prejudices of modern theological alchymists. As it has been proved that there are not two distinct Abrahamic covenants, permit me now to shew that the Abrahamic and Sinaitic are two distinct covenants, which never have coalesced and never will. According to the Scriptures, they differ in the following features.

1. They are said to be *two*. “Which things are an allegory: for these are the *two* covenants.”(d)

2. They differ in their tendency. This is proved by the words immediately following those just now quoted. “The one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.(d)

3. They are distinguished as *my* and *thy* covenants; the Lord claiming the one which tends to promote liber-

(d) Gal. iv. 24.

ty. "Nevertheless, I will remember *my* covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish [or confirm it] unto thee [as] an everlasting covenant. "Then thou shalt remember thy ways, and be ashamed, "when thou shalt receive thy sister, [the Gentiles] "thine elder and thy younger: and I will give them "unto thee for daughters, but not by *thy* covenant. And "I will establish [or confirm] *my* covenant, [made in "the days of thy youth] with thee."^(c) My Opponent justly remarks that Ezekiel here "promises the union of "Jews and Gentiles under a covenant positively declared to be not the Sinaitic," for he says, "not by *thy* covenant." The next question is, what is that everlasting covenant, which, in this short passage, the Lord twice promises that he will *establish* or *confirm* on the union of the Jews and Gentiles? Dr. Gill says it is "the covenant of grace, made with the Messiah and his "spiritual seed; which is *confirmed of God in Christ*." But both he and my Opponent believe the "covenant confirmed of God in Christ" to be the Abrahamic covenant. And where is this everlasting covenant first said to be *established* or *confirmed*? It is in Gen. xvii. Yes, in the seventh verse of that offensive chapter, God says, "I will *establish* my covenant between me and thee, "and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an "everlasting covenant." It is here also that Gill's admirable commentary says that this establishing of the covenant, means that God will "not only *renew* it, but "*confirm* it by the following token of circumcision."

This, therefore, is “*my* covenant with thee in the days “of thy youth.” Gill’s Baptist prejudices make him anxious to confine the days of their youth to the Sinaitic covenant. He nevertheless approves of the declaration of Kimchi, who says that “all the while they were in “Egypt, and until they came into the land of Canaan, “were called the days of their youth.” This account of their youth embraces many centuries before the Sinaitic covenant, during all of which time they were under the Abrahamic covenant, in which God had predicted their bondage in Egypt, and deliverance from it.(f) This was done in a covenant which was made before the institution of circumcision, and only “renewed” and “confirmed” in the appointment of that seal. This covenant which God confirmed with them in their youth, by circumcision, he promises to confirm with them on the union of Jews and Gentiles, that it may indeed be an everlasting covenant, after that of Sinai is abolished.

4. They differ in their dates. Moses says, “The “Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. “The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, “but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this “day.”(g) Gill *supposes* that the fathers here mentioned, may “be understood of their more remote ancestors, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with whom the “covenant of grace was made, or afresh made manifest, “especially with the former; when the law, the covenant here spoken of, was not delivered until 430 years

(f) Gen. xv. 13—16.

(g) Deut. v. 2. 3.

“after. Gal. iii. 16. 17.” These references read as follows: “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.”

5. They differ in their qualities. “But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises. For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.”(h) Notwithstanding the obscurity of what my Opponent says on this passage,(i) you may perceive that he admits the Sinaitic covenant to be the old and faulty one which gives way to the new and better covenant. Thus also Dr. Gill; “That the Sinai covenant is intended, is clear by the following circumstance: ‘In the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt;’ that is, immediately after their being

(h) Heb. viii. 6—9.

(i) Spur. Deb. with me, p. 246.

“brought out of Egypt, the covenant was made with
 “them.”(j) But the question in dispute is, What is
 meant by the new and better covenant, which is so far
 superior to that of Sinai? My Opponent can give no
 other account of it than to assure you that it is a *new*
 covenant, essentially different from the *Abrahamic*. If
 so, it must be newly made, or newly revealed, or both
 newly made and revealed. My opinion is, that it is no
 new constitution or revelation, but a new administration
 of a covenant revealed to Abraham.

My Opponent has sometimes made a show of quoting
 our Confession of Faith against me. Permit me to quote
 it on this occasion. It is an excellent expositor of Scrip-
 ture; it speaks my sentiments in better words than my
 own; and it gives me an opportunity of shewing the ex-
 act agreement which there is between the highest Bap-
 tist and Pedobaptist authorities on this subject. In rela-
 tion to the covenant of Grace, our Confession speaks as
 follows, viz. “This covenant was differently adminis-
 “tered in the time of the law, and in the time of the
 “gospel: under the law it was administered by pro-
 “mises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the Pas-
 “chal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered
 “to the people of the Jews, all foreshadowing Christ to
 “come, which were for that time sufficient and effica-
 “cious, through the operation of the Spirit, to instruct
 “and build up the elect in faith in the promised Mes-
 “siah, by whom they had full remission of sins, and
 “eternal salvation; and is called the Old Testament.

(j) Gill on Jer. xxxi. 32, which Paul quotes.

“ Under the gospel, when Christ the substance, was ex-
 “ hibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dis-
 “ pensed are the preaching of the word, and the admin-
 “ istration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s
 “ supper ; which, though fewer in number, and admin-
 “ istered with more simplicity and less outward glory,
 “ yet in them it is held forth, in more fulness, evidence,
 “ and spiritual efficacy, to all nations, both Jews and
 “ Gentiles ; and is called the New Testament. There
 “ are not, therefore, two covenants of grace differing in
 “ substance, but one and the same under various dis-
 “ pensations.”(1) In support of these sentiments, the
 Confession refers to those passages in which Jeremiah
 and Paul speak of the old and faulty covenant giving
 way to the new and better one. It also refers to several
 texts which relate to the Abrahamic covenant and its
 seal. The extract, with its proofs, goes to shew that
 the authors of the Confession believed with me, that the
 new covenant of Jeremiah and Paul, was no new consti-
 tution or new revelation, but a new administration of a
 covenant revealed to Abraham.

The coincidence of Dr. Gill’s opinion will appear in
 the following extract, viz. “ ‘ That I will make a new
 “ ‘ covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house
 “ ‘ Judah ;’ by this *covenant* is meant the covenant of
 “ grace ; called *new*, not because newly made, for it
 “ was made with the elect in Christ from everlasting ;
 “ so early was Christ set up as the Mediator of it ; and
 “ so early were promises made, and blessings given to

(1) Confession, Ch. 7. Sect. 5. 6.

“ them in him : nor because newly revealed ; for it was
 “ made known to all the saints more or less, under the
 “ former dispensation, particularly to David, to Abra-
 “ ham, yea, to our first parents immediately after the
 “ fall, though more clearly manifested under the gospel
 “ dispensation ; but because of its new mode of exhi-
 “ bition ; not by types, and shadows, and sacrifices, as
 “ formerly ; but by the ministry of the word, and the
 “ administration of gospel ordinances ; and in distinc-
 “ tion from the former covenant, which is done away,
 “ as to the mode of it ; and because it is a famous cov-
 “ enant, an excellent one, a better covenant, best of all ;
 “ better than the covenant of works, and even better
 “ than the covenant of grace, under the former admin-
 “ istration.”(m) There is no difficulty in seeing from
 this extract, that Dr. Gill believes that the new and bet-
 ter covenant which supplants the Sinaitic, is no new
 constitution or revelation, but only a new administration
 of the covenant of grace, revealed to Abraham, and
 even to Adam ; and exhibited to God’s people both in
 the Old and in the New dispensations, in ecclesiastical
 ordinances ; so that it is an ecclesiastical exhibition of
 the covenant of grace, Dr. Gill himself being judge.

But this is not all. The same sentiments, as far as is
 necessary for the point now in hand, have been officially
 declared by the Regular Baptist churches of England
 and America, in “ *A Confession of Faith put forth*
 “ *by the Elders and Brethren, of many Congregations*
 “ *of Christians, (baptised upon profession of their*

“*faith,*) in London and the country. Adopted by the
 “*Baptist Association met at Philadelphia, September*
 “*25, 1742.*” In relation to the subject now before
 us, this Baptist Formulary says, “This covenant is re-
 “vealed in the gospel first of all to Adam in the pro-
 “mise of salvation by the seed of the woman, and after-
 “wards by farther steps, until the full discovery there-
 “of was completed in the New Testament; and it is
 “founded in that eternal covenant transaction, that was
 “between the Father and the Son about the redemption
 “of the elect; and it is alone by the grace of this cov-
 “enant, that all of the posterity of fallen Adam, that
 “ever were saved, did obtain life and blessed im-
 “mortality; man being now utterly incapable of accep-
 “tance with God upon those terms on which Adam
 “stood in his state of innocency.”⁽ⁿ⁾ I would call your
 attention to a particular doctrine stated in this extract,
 in connexion with the texts referred to in the bottom of
 the page to support it. The doctrine is, that “it is
 “alone by the grace of this covenant, that all of the
 “posterity of fallen Adam, that ever were saved, did
 “obtain life and blessed immortality.” In support of
 this doctrine, this Baptist Confession refers to John viii.
 56. “Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day;
 “and he saw it, and was glad.” But lest this should
 leave us in doubt, whether they meant the Abrahamic
 covenant, with or without the seal of circumcision, this
 same Baptist Confession refers us to Rom. iv. through-
 out; which dwells almost wholly upon the Abrahamic

(n) Chap. 7. Sect. 3.

Covenant as recorded in Gen. xvii. where Abraham “received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised.” This shews from the highest Baptist authority in the world, that the new and better covenant of the New Testament church, which supplants the Sinaitic covenant, is no new constitution or revelation, but only a new administration of the eternal covenant of grace, which was revealed to Adam in Gen. iii. and which was visibly and ecclesiastically exhibited to Abraham, in Gen. xvii. where it was sealed with circumcision.

Notwithstanding the great inferiority of the covenant of Sinai, its institutions were an obscure publication of the gospel. It was therefore *subservient* to the covenant of grace. But, that it made, comparatively, a very slender provision for the consolation and salvation of the church, is evident from the fact that Moses, by whom it was given, goes past his own ceremonial and legal covenant, and resorts to that of Abraham, when interceding for rebellious Israel. In the same chapter of his law, the legal character of the one covenant, and the gracious character of the other are plainly marked. Speaking the language of the Sinaitic covenant, he says, “But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments, and if ye shall despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but that ye break my covenant, I also will do this unto you.” Then he denounces multiplied and aggravated curses upon them. Dr. Gill says that this was “the covenant made

“with them at Sinai, when they promised on their part, “that they would hearken and be obedient.”(o) Immediately after this Moses adds, “If they shall confess “their iniquity,” “then will I remember my covenant “with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also “my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I “will remember the land.” Gill says that this covenant “chiefly respects the multiplication of their seed, “the continuance of them, and the Messiah springing “from them; which is the mercy promised to these fathers, and the principal part of the covenant made “with them, and which was remembered and performed “when God visited and *redeemed* his people by him, “Luke i. 68—73.”(p) Immediately after the Sinaitic covenant was given, and Aaron and the people had provoked the Lord with the golden calf, Moses says, “Turn “from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against “thy people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel “thy servants, to whom thou swearest by thine own “self.”(q) To this was God’s mercy ascribed in after days. “And the Lord was gracious unto them, and “had compassion on them, and had respect unto them, “because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and would not destroy them, neither cast he them “from his presence as yet.”(r) In the Jewish synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, Paul shewed that the Abrahamic covenant may well serve as a text for a gospel sermon. “And we declare unto you glad tidings, how “that the promise which was made unto the fathers,

(o) Gill on Lev. xxvi. 15.
(q) Ex. xxxii. 12. 13.

(p) Gill on Lev. xxvi. 42.
(r) 2 Kings xiii. 23.

“ God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in
 “ that he hath raised up Jesus again.” Dr. Gill says
 that this promise is “not barely and solely that which
 “ respects the resurrection of Christ, but the mission
 “ of him, the exhibition of him in human nature, his
 “ incarnation, his work and business he was to do,
 “ namely, to obtain salvation for his people; it chiefly
 “ regards the promise of his coming into the world to
 “ do the will of God, which promise was made to Abra-
 “ ham, Isaac, Jacob, and Judah.”(s)

6. There is such a difference in the duration of the
 Abrahamic and Sinaitic covenants, as totally to forbid
 the amalgamation system. We have already found that
 Paul meant the covenant of Sinai, when he said, “ Now
 “ that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to van-
 “ ish away.”(t) This covenant vanished soon after the
 coming of Christ: but where is the evidence that the
 Abrahamic covenant vanished at that period? Instead
 of that, Paul represents Abraham as the father of be-
 lieving Gentiles as well as Jews.(u) It was concerning
 this period that God said, “Then will I remember my
 “ covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac,
 “ and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember.”
 Dr. Gill expressly says that this covenant “ was remem-
 “ bered and performed when God visited and redeemed
 “ his people by him [Christ] Luke i. 68—73.” The
 Psalmist says “ He hath remembered his covenant for
 “ ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand

(s) Gill on Acts xiii. 32.

(t) Hebr. viii. 13.

(u) Rom. iv. 11. 12. Compare Is. lv. 3—5. lvi. 4—8, where the ex-
 tension of the covenant to Gentiles is foretold.

“ generations : which covenant he made with Abraham, “ and his oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same unto “ Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant.” Dr. Gill says that this covenant “ shall “ stand good, and be punctually performed, ‘ to a thousand generations,’ that is, forever.”(v) For this also, as well as the last text, he refers to the latter part of the first Chapter of Luke. “ Blessed be the Lord God “ of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people,” “ to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, “ and to remember his holy covenant,” “ which,” says Dr. Gill, “ was made between him and his Son from “ all eternity ; and was, at various times, dispensed and “ manifested to the patriarchs, and eminent saints, as “ Adam, Noah, Abraham, &c.”(w) This is confirmed by the very next verse, which says, “ the oath which “ he sware to our father Abraham.” Besides referring us to this passage from the Psalm just now quoted, the Doctor sends us to three different places in Genesis, among which we find the seventeenth chapter, where this covenant is confirmed of God in Christ, by the seal of circumcision. It is not, therefore, some other Abrahamic covenant, but the covenant of circumcision, which God has “ ‘ commanded to a thousand generations,’ that “ is, forever,” as the Doctor says. If, therefore, the Abrahamic covenant of circumcision is eternal in its duration, and the Sinaitic covenant has already perished, their amalgamation must be a work of imagination only.

(v) Gill on Ps. cv. 8.

(w) Gill on Luke i. lxxii.

It appears, therefore, from the bible and the highest Baptist authority, that the *one* Abrahamic covenant, sealed with circumcision, is perpetual; that notwithstanding the change of administration, the covenant is the same; and that this ecclesiastical exhibition of the covenant of grace is the common constitution of the Jewish society before Christ, and of the Christian society after Christ; wherefore these societies having one constitution, are one church; which was the point to be proved.

We have now finished the evidence promised in support of the second proposition, that “the Christian church is a branch of the Abrahamic church; or in other words, the Jewish society before Christ, and the Christian society after Christ are one and the same church in different administrations.” We have proved this by the substantial sameness of their religion: they have the same theology, morality, worship, government, and discipline. This has, moreover, been shewn from the manner in which the same names are given to them: they are both God’s peculiar treasure, a royal priesthood, and an holy nation. They are both God’s ecclesiastical tree and vineyard; foundation, floor, and house; kingdom and commonwealth; man and body; brethren, bride and children. And it has just now been shewn that the same ecclesiastical exhibition of the eternal covenant of grace is the one common constitution of the

two societies : wherefore they must be one church, though in different dispensations. Both the premises and the conclusion have been supported by the Scriptures, and it has been shewn that they are both ratified by Doctor Gill, the greatest Baptist writer who ever lived. If, through prejudice or forgetfulness, any one doubt the correctness of this statement, let him candidly attend to what the Doctor says, on that declaration of Solomon, that “Wisdom hath builded her house ; she hath hewn out her seven pillars.”(h) This, Gill says, is “the church of Christ on earth, the house of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.” “Such a house there was under the Old Testament, and such an one there is under the New ; and which is continually building up by Christ, by means of the word and ordinances, and will continue to the end of the world.” When Solomon says, “There is no new thing under the sun,”(i) Dr. Gill says, that even “spiritual things,” “though in some sense new, *are also old* ; or there have been THE SAME THINGS FOR SUBSTANCE in former ages, “and from the beginning, as now ; such as *the new covenant of grace* ; the new and living way to God ; new creatures in Christ ; a new name ; *the New Testament, and the doctrines of it ; new ordinances*, and the new commandment of love ; and yet these, in some sense, *are all old things*, and indeed are THE SAME IN SUBSTANCE.” These are the words of Dr. Gill. In them you find express and repeated acknowledgments of the scriptural truths, that the church and covenant, doc-

(h) Prov. ix. 1.

(i) Eccles. i. 9.

trines and ordinances, of the Old and New Testament, are “THE SAME THINGS FOR SUBSTANCE;” “THE SAME IN SUBSTANCE.” If, in relation to these ordinances, Providence enable me to prove, from Scripture, the *sigillistical* identity of circumcision and baptism, and the unrepealed requirement that this seal shall be administered to infants, it will plainly appear, from infallible authority, that there is a divine command for infant-baptism.

PROPOSITION III.

JEWISH CIRCUMCISION BEFORE CHRIST, AND CHRISTIAN BAPTISM AFTER CHRIST, ARE ONE AND THE SAME SEAL IN SUBSTANCE, THOUGH IN DIFFERENT FORMS.

The word *seal* sometimes signifies an *instrument* for making an impression upon wax or some other substance; it sometimes means the *impression* made by this instrument; it sometimes signifies that *confirmation* which is imparted by this impression; and it sometimes denotes any significant act by which confirmation is effected even without a visible permanent impression. Ahab had an *implement* called a *seal*; Jezebel made the *impression* of it upon the letters which she sent to the elders and to the nobles; and this royal *attestation* or *confirmation* procured the destruction of Naboth.(x) In order to bring the Jews to a similar end, Haman sent throughout the Persian empire, letters “*sealed* with the kings

(x) 1 Kings xxi. 8.

ring.”(y) That instrument of authority which these persons obtained for the worst purposes, the Egyptian monarch conferred upon his favourite Joseph, for the public good ; “ And Pharaoh took off his *ring* from his hand, and put it upon Joseph’s hand.”(z) So Antiochus is represented as giving his *signet* (his *ring* in the Greek and Latin,) to Philip his regent ;(a) and the dying Alexander is said to have given his *ring* to Perdicas for the same reason. When Paul says to the Corinthians, “ The *seal* of mine Apostleship are ye in the Lord,”(b) he does not mean that they are the *instrument* or the *impression*, but the *attestation* or *confirmation* of his Apostleship. Dr. Gill considers it as “ alluding to the *sealing* of deeds “ and writings, which renders them authentic; or to the “ *sealing* of letters, *confirming* the truth of what is “ therein expressed.” Christ says, “ He that hath received his testimony, hath set to his *seal* that God is “ true.”(c) Dr. Gill tells us that “ he seals, ratifies, “ and *confirms*” this doctrine. Sealing, in this passage, is certainly used in the sense of *attestation*. It moreover has this meaning and that of *confirmation* where Paul says that “ He [Abraham] received the sign of circumcision a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he “ had yet being uncircumcised.(d) Here Dr. Gill justly remarks that “ circumcision was a *seal*, not for secresy, “ but for *certainty*; it being a *confirmation*,” &c. This

(y) Esth. iii. 12.

(z) Gen. xli. 42. See Gill.

(a) 1 Maccab. vi. 14. 15. So Cyrus is said to have “ shut the door and sealed it with the kings *signet*,” (or *ring*, as it is in the Greek of Bel and the Dragon, verses 11. 14.)

(b) 1 Cor. ix. 2. See Gill.

(c) John iii. 33. See Gill.

(d) Rom. iv. 11. See Gill, whom we have formerly quoted more fully on this passage.

confirmation or *attestation* is what we mean by the *substance* of the seal ; while the particular *impression* or *significant ceremony* is called the *form* of the seal. As the *form* is arbitrary, it may be changed indefinitely, while the *substance* remains the same. The text just now quoted shews that circumcision, as to its *substance*, is an attestation of the righteousness of faith ; that is, it is a confirmation of the doctrine of justification by faith : but this is the *substance* of baptism also, however it may differ from circumcision in respect of *form* ; and for this reason those who have received Christian baptism are said, in the Apocalypse, to have “ the *seal* of God in their foreheads.” That these two rites are one and the same seal in substance, though in different forms, can be proved from Scripture.

In opposition to this, my Opponent believes that baptism never was a seal at all ; that even circumcision never was a seal to any but Abraham ; and that the *form* of a seal is essential to its existence, so that the *form* cannot be changed without destroying the *substance*. His reasoning is as follows, viz. “ Was not circumcision
 “ significant of something ? could it not be seen and ex-
 “ amined by every body ? and what did it say ? It said
 “ ‘ *I am a Jew of the seed of Abraham, entitled to every*
 “ ‘ *thing promised my father, when God told him*
 “ ‘ *to make this mark upon me.*’ Deface this mark in
 “ the flesh, and sprinkle a few drops of water upon the
 “ face, and then say, it is the *same seal* significant of the
 “ same thing—that is, this watery seal can be seen on
 “ the flesh, examined by every body, and says, What?—
 “ Just what circumcision said,—‘ I am a Jew, of the seed

“ ‘ of Abraham, entitled to every thing promised my
 “ ‘ father, when God told him to make this mark upon
 “ ‘ me!!’ It surely lies, if it tell such a tale.

“ A seal, Mr. M‘Calla says, is a *confirmative mark*.
 “ Now who ever thought that water left a confirmative
 “ mark on the forehead of a child? But remember, my
 “ friends, I called upon my Opponent to tell us where
 “ baptism is called a seal. No where I say in the bible.
 “ to presume that baptism is a seal, and to presume that
 “ it is substituted in the place of circumcision, and that
 “ the seal is changed, is taking too much liberty in an
 “ argument. One presumption might, in some instances,
 “ be tolerated, but it is too presumptuous to demand
 “ three, nay to adopt them without any ceremony, and
 “ place them as the basis of an argument.

“ I deny that circumcision was ever changed into any
 “ thing—that baptism is a *seal* of any covenant in the
 “ legitimate use of language :—and consequently that
 “ baptism came in the room of circumcision. And, I po-
 “ sitively say that Mr. M‘Calla cannot produce one text
 “ in the Bible in proof of the contrary.—I say again, it
 “ is quite too *presumptuous*, to presume so far as to take
 “ three suppositions as facts acknowledged, and place
 “ them as the foundation of an important part of the
 “ system.”

“ And after all that has been said of circumcision as
 “ a *seal*, it is only called a seal once, and in relation to
 “ one circumstance, in the life of one individual. It
 “ never was a seal to one of Adam’s race in the same
 “ sense, and for the same purpose, as it was to Abra-
 “ ham. Mark the Apostle’s style—He received the

“ SIGN of circumcision, this was its common import to
 “ all the Jews—he received *the sign*, its common name;
 “ to him in particular a *seal*; of what? of his interest
 “ in the covenant?—No, this he had guaranteed by the
 “ veracity of God.—A seal of what?—Of the righteous-
 “ ness of that faith—what faith? of the faith which he
 “ should afterwards have?—No, no: but of the faith he
 “ had.—When? Sixteen years before this time; when
 “ his faith was counted unto him for righteousness: and
 “ twenty-four years before this time he believed the
 “ promise of God, and left his own country and his fa-
 “ ther’s house in the obedience of faith. The whole
 “ mystery dissolves at the touch of common sense, when
 “ it is simply known, that Abraham received the usual
 “ *sign* of circumcision, which to him was a pledge or
 “ mark of the divine acceptance of his faith.”

My Baptist Opponent is unhappy in his distinction between *signs* and *seals*. He pretends that circumcision was a *sign* both to Abraham and his descendants, but that it was a *seal* to Abraham only, and not to one of his descendants. It may be safely affirmed that this is one of my Opponent’s original discoveries. It was entirely unknown even to Hezekiah, the ancient Greek Glossographer. Of two significations which he gives to the word *sign*, *seal* is one: (a) and in explaining the word *seals*, he says that they are “those *signs* which are upon rings and clothes.” (z) Harpocration also, in his Lexicon, explains the one word by the other, as follows, viz. “*Signs*, so they call *seals*.” (g) Dr. Gill, who quotes

(a) Σημειον, τερας, ή σφραγις.

(z) Σφραγιδες, αι επι των δακτυλιων και τα των ιματιων σημεια.

(g) σημεια ουντω λεγουσι τας σφραγιδας.

this with approbation, says that the text in question might be rendered “which *sign* was a *seal*.” And Castellio’s New Testament actually gives it this rendering. (*h*) After my Opponent’s loud call to you, to “mark “ the Apostle’s style,” in this passage, you will be surprised to find, that, in his New Testament, he has followed Macknight, in a translation which agrees with our views. His version is as follows, viz. “And he received the *mark* of circumcision as a *seal*,” &c. Here is nothing about circumcision being a *sign* to the Jews in general, but a *seal* to Abraham only. This translation informs you that a *sign* is a *mark*; and he has repeatedly told you in this debate, that a *seal* is a confirmative *mark*. Now if, according to my Opponent’s own shewing, a *sign* is a *mark*, and a *seal* is a *mark*, and if Abraham received the *sign* or *mark* of circumcision as a *seal* or *mark* of the righteousness of faith, then where is my Opponent’s distinction between signs and seals? It is surely not in Dr. Macknight, whose translation he has copied with approbation; for the Doctor confirms my interpretation, in his version, commentary, and critical note.

But some Baptists who acknowledge that the view of my Opponent makes a distinction without a difference, are still unwilling to admit that circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith to any but Abraham. Yet the reason which they give for this opinion, is not only a gratuitous assumption, but is in manifest opposition to inspired authority. It is a mere assertion that outward

(*h*) ac circumcisionis *notam* accepit, quae *sigillum* esset, &c.

ordinances *cannot* be a seal of the righteousness of faith, and that nothing less than Christ and the Divine Spirit *can* be this seal. The greatest man among them speaks as follows ; viz. “But alas! not ordinances, but other
 “ things more valuable than they, are the seals of the
 “ covenant, and of believers ; the blood of Christ is the
 “ seal, and the only seal of the covenant of grace, by
 “ which its promises and blessings are ratified and con-
 “ firmed ; and the Holy Spirit is the only earnest
 “ pledge, seal, and sealer of the saints, until the day
 “ of redemption.”⁽ⁱ⁾ This author will very readily admit that justification by faith is a blessing which believers derive from the covenant of grace : if therefore, his assertion be true, that ordinances are not the seals of the covenant and of believers, then it is also true that ordinances are not the seal of the righteousness of faith : but this, as we observed, is in manifest opposition to the scriptures, which declare that Abraham “re-
 “ ceived the sign of circumcision, a seal of the right-
 “ eousness of faith.

Some, however, admit that Abraham received this ordinance as a seal, but deny that it was a seal in the case of any other person except Abraham. This is a sentiment, and a mode of interpretation, which, I suspect, neither Jew nor Gentile ever thought of, until it was found necessary to the enemies of infant-baptism. The opinion of the Jews may be ascertained from their Targum, as quoted by Dr. Gill, who says that “The Apos-
 “ tle uses the word *seal* concerning circumcision, it being

(i) Gill on Rom. iv. 11.

“ a word his countrymen made use of when they spoke
 “ of it; thus, paraphrasing on Cant. iii. 8. [comp. iv.
 “ 12.] they say, ‘ every one of them was *sealed* with the
 “ ‘ *seal* of circumcision upon their flesh, as Abraham
 “ ‘ was sealed in his flesh.’ ” Moreover, in one of their
 Apocryphal books, the Jewish author represents God as
 saying to him, “ Behold *the number of those that be*
sealed in the feast of the Lord.”(j) This feast was evi-
 dently the Passover, to which the *sealing* of circumci-
 sion was a prerequisite; and the number of those who
 were thus sealed, is, in the context, said to be “ a
 “ great people whom I could not number.” This pas-
 sage is referred to by Dr. Gill, in illustration of John’s
 declaration that “ there were *sealed* an hundred and
 “ forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the child-
 “ ren of Israel.”(k) The context of this passage shews
 that they were sealed by the application of the outward
 sign, as well as by the inward grace. In perfect conform-
 ity with this Jewish usage, inspired and uninspired, the
 Shepherd of Hermas, in a passage quoted by my Oppo-
 nent against Mr. Walker, repeatedly calls the initiatory
 ordinance of the church a *seal* in relation to all who
 receive it. Among the Christian Fathers who followed
 him in this usage, we find Epiphanius saying, “ The
 “ law had the circumcision in the flesh, serving for a
 “ time, till the great circumcision came, that is, Baptism;
 “ which circumcises us from our sins, and *seals* us unto
 “ the name of God.” In the same strain, we find Au-
 gustine drawing a parallel between Abraham and Cor-

(j) 2 Esdras ii. 58. Comp. 42.

(k) Rev. vii. 4. Comp. 3.

nelius, on the one hand, who were *sealed* with the initiatory ordinance, after they had believed ; and on the other hand, Isaac and Christian infants, who, in maturity, enjoy that righteousness of faith, “ the *seal* whereof had “ gone before.”

But to confine the seal to Abraham exclusively, my Opponent says, “ It is only called a seal once, and in relation to one circumstance, in the life of one individual.” Does he mean by this, that we are not to believe the Scriptures, if they say a thing only *once* ? But let us try such reasoning in refutation of his argument for female communion ; and see whether he will admit its correctness. In his debate with Mr. Walker, he professed to have express authority for female communion. It was in the following words, viz. “ For there was a certain *disciple* there named *Tabitha*.”⁽¹⁾ What would he do with an antagonist who would seriously deny the force of this evidence, and pretend to refute it, by saying that “ female discipleship is mentioned only *once*, and in relation to *one* circumstance, in the life of *one* individual ? ” I will tell you what he would do ; he would almost dance with ecstasy at obtaining, at last, one solid, though solitary evidence of his Antagonist’s insincerity, or the weakness of his cause ; and it would serve him for matter of declamation in almost every speech throughout the remainder of the debate. I am not disposed to furnish him with such provender, although he has gone on many a foraging excursion in pursuit of it. Although the case of *Tabitha* is not an express command for female

(1) Acts ix. 36. See his Spurious Debate with Mr. Walker, p. 69.

communion, nor any better evidence for it, than we have for infant-baptism, yet it is certainly good evidence, notwithstanding the fact that female discipleship is mentioned only once, and concerning only one person. So, if it were true that circumcision is called a *seal* only once, and that in the history of *one* person, this is so far from proving that it is a seal in no other case, that it proves the very contrary. In the history of Adam, it is said only once, and concerning one individual, that he “begat a son in his own *likeness*, after his *image*,” Does this prove that Seth was the only descendant of Adam who was born in his likeness, and after his image, or does it not rather prove the contrary? Circumcision did not become a *seal* by the mere fact of Abraham’s receiving it, but “he received the mark of circumcision *as a seal*” already appointed in that covenant which required him to be circumcised : neither did his reception of it make it cease to be a *seal*, for Isaac and Jacob were as much interested in the covenant of circumcision as Abraham himself ; and in their case, and in the cases of all others to whom it was lawfully administered, whether infants or adults, saints or sinners, it was a *seal* of the righteousness of faith ; that is, it was a visible *attestation* or *confirmation* of the doctrine of justification by faith, and not by works ; the doctrine of salvation by the grace of God, through the blood and Spirit of Christ. It is not true, as some suppose, that this ordinance was a *seal*, only when administered to an heir of heaven, whether in infancy or maturity : the word of God is as true when it becomes a savour of death unto death, as when it is received in faith : so the doctrine of justification by faith

is as truly *sealed*, *confirmed*, or *attested* in the circumcision of Ishmael as of Isaac, of Esau as of Jacob. It is true that some subjects of this ordinance have the inestimable advantage of having the inward grace accompanying the outward sign ; but it is not this fact which makes it a SEAL : for if its significancy depended upon the certainty of grace in the receiver, it would be an empty form to all but the searcher of hearts, and those of his children who have attained the full assurance of faith : but it confirms the same truth to the weak believer as to the strong ; and it attests the same doctrine of justification by faith, to the unbeliever as to the believer ; for the unbelief of man can never make the faith of God of none effect, or make him alter his plan of saving sinners. This ordinance was not intended to *seal* a fact but a doctrine : it was not intended to declare that the individual receiver should be saved, but to teach that if he be saved, it must be through the blood and righteousness of his law-satisfying Surety ; and that every one who has an interest in this Divine Redeemer, whether he be an infant or adult, shall be saved.

Although circumcision *sealed* this truth, my Opponent insists upon it that baptism cannot be a *seal* at all, because water leaves no mark behind it. He triumphantly asks, “ Now who ever thought that water left “ a confirmative mark on the forehead of a child ? ” (*m*) My Opponent forgets that the rainbow is the token of the Noachic covenant, and that the word *seal* is used not only for a visible permanent impression, but to de-

(*m*) Spur. Deb. with me, p. 204, quoted above.

note “any act of confirmation,” as the Baptist Lexicographer, Dr. Allison, says. But if a seal must mean a visible wound and a permanent mark or scar made in the flesh by a knife, will my Opponent be so good as to inform us what mark was made by the angels, when they “sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads?” Dr. Gill thinks that these “servants of our God” are the Waldenses and Albigenses. Now although it was maliciously said against them, that their children were born with wattles hanging to their throats, it was never even suspected that they took a knife, and tattooed their children in the face, after the manner of the heathen. I hope however, in due time, to shew that they sealed the foreheads of their children by that “act of confirmation” which we call *Christian baptism*. This interpretation is rather confirmed than confuted by the same Apostle’s declaration that “A Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father’s name written in their foreheads.”(n) When I say that this inscription is a seal, I am in no danger of contradiction from my Opponent, who has substituted the word *inscription* for the word *seal*, in his Translation of the New Testament. Where our bible says “The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal,” my Opponent’s Version says, “The foundation of God standeth firm, having this inscription.” Now as this *seal* or inscription was put upon this foundation without any literal visible mark, so was the name of the Lamb’s Father sealed or inscribed.

(n) Rev. vii. 3. xiv. 1.

ed upon his people's foreheads without a permanent mark. But my Opponent may object, that in baptism, not the name of the Father only, but the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit is written on his people. This suggests the fact that some very ancient Manuscripts had the names of these three persons, if we may believe the authors of the Ethiopic Version, as reported by Dr. Gill. The same Baptist commentator tells us that "The Alexandrian copy, the Complutensian edition, the Vulgate Latin, Syriac, and Arabic versions, read, 'Having his name [the Lamb's] and his Fathers name written in their foreheads.'" This reading Griesbach has adopted. It is, however, unnecessary to our purpose, because, in relation to baptism, the bible elsewhere mentions the name of only one person, when all are evidently implied by the writer, and were expressed in the administration of the ordinance.(o)

These various readings handed down by transcribers and translators shew the understanding of the ancient church, in relation to the question whether baptism is a *seal*. My Opponent himself has suggested an additional evidence of this sort, which is very striking indeed. In his debate with Mr. Walker, he made very pompous use of the Primate's Translation of THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS. He professed to quote largely from the writings of *the Shepherd of Hermas*, who, (as he informed the audience,) "is commonly supposed to be the *Hermas*, of whom Paul speaks," in his Epistle to

(o) Acts xix. 5.

the Romans. (*p*) If this be so, he must have caught the sentiments and language of the Apostles in relation to *seals*. Certain it is, that he mentions the word, with as much familiarity and rapidity of repetition, as I have done in this conference. In the 17th Section of his 9th Similitude, he speaks much like the Apostle John when foretelling that the name of the [Lamb and of his] Father should be inscribed or sealed upon his people. Hermas says, “ All the nations which are under heaven, “ have heard and believed in the same one name of the “ Son of God by whom they are called; wherefore, “ having received his SEAL, they have all been made “ partakers of the same understanding and knowledge, “ and their faith and charity have been the same.” When Hermas speaks of receiving the *seal* of the Son of God, in being called by his name, does he, or does he not, mean that *baptism*, which initiates into the church, and gives us the name of Christian? This question is fully answered, in the preceding Section, in which, among seven repetitions of this word, Hermas says expressly, “ *Now that SEAL is the water of BAPTISM.*” Here we have my Opponent’s own Author, whom he has introduced to you, as a personal friend and acquaintance of the Apostle Paul, confirming our view of that seal of God, that seal of the righteousness of faith, or as Hermas would have it, that seal of “ understanding “ and knowledge,” of “ faith and charity,” which takes the place of circumcision: “ Now that *seal* is the “ water of *baptism.*”

Although circumcision is called a *seal*, and baptism is called a *seal*, yet the proposition now under discussion, contends that they are not radically two different *seals*, but different *forms* of the same *seal*. It is *substantially* the same now, that it was in the Old Testament church. Among the Jews, “The *rite* of circumcision was no more than the *form* in which the *seal* was applied;” as Dr. Mason has correctly remarked. Much of the force of my Opponent’s reasoning against this doctrine, may be found in his polite, dignified, argumentative, and eloquent explosion against this remark of Dr. Mason’s. On it he speaks as follows, viz. “What sophistry! “What disregard to common sense! What an insult to “the human understanding! The *rite* of circumcision! “What was that? the making of a mark in the flesh. “The *rite* was the *form* of the seal! The making of “the mark was the mark of the ‘*confirmative mark!!!*’ “When the varnish is washed off this sophistry, such “is its meaning—such is its naked deformity. The “*rite* of circumcision was circumcision itself, accord- “ing to every body’s views of rites. The *form* of cir- “cumcision, was the *form* of the *rite*. Take away “the *form* of a mark or of a seal, and then shew it to “us. It is invisible. Hence the whole distinction is “absurd.”(q)

This desperate fluttering of my Opponent is introduced, not to follow him in every dash or splash which he may make, but to call your attention to his general course. In this rhapsody, as well as others which were

noticed a while ago, his object is, evidently, to deny that the *form* and the *substance* of a *seal* may differ from each other, and that a *seal* may change its *form* and retain its *substance*. It is in relation to this that he says, “*The whole distinction is absurd.*” According to him they are inseparable: where the one is found, there is the other; and where the one is not, there the other is wanting. This would very readily decide the controversy between king Charles the First and his Parliament. According to this doctrine, while the Parliament held the *seal* of state, they were invested with the sovereignty; and Lord Clarendon restored the sovereignty to the king, by stealing the *seal* and taking it to him. This view of the subject, however, did not suit the religion or the politics of either party in that momentous struggle. While the Parliament had the *seal*, the royalists esteemed them as having the *form*, but the king as having the *substance*: so when the king obtained the *seal*, the enemies of *Toryism* and of the *Royal Prerogative*, considered the king as having the *form*, but the Parliament the *substance*. My Opponent very pertly says “the *rite* [or *form*] of circumcision was circumcision itself.” Very well; the Arabs and apostate Jews of the present day have this *form*. Again he tells us what is its *substance* or *signification*. According to him “it said, ‘*I am a Jew of the seed of Abraham, entitled to every thing promised my Father, when God told him to make this mark upon me.*’” Does my Opponent consider this the language of the circumcision of the Arabs and of the excommunicated Jews of the present day? If not, then we have the *rite* distinct from the *signification*;

that is, we have the *form* without the *substance*. In sacred and profane antiquity we find *seals* affixed to soldiers and servants. The form of their devices would often doubtless differ, far more than the bald eagle differs from the American turkey, which Dr. Franklin proposed as a substitute for the bird of prey, on the *seal* of the United States; and would differ more than a *cross mark*, formerly appointed by our government, as a seal for bonds and notes, differs from a *circular mark*, which, as Mr. Walker informed my Opponent, they have lately ordained as a substitute.^(r) Besides this difference in the figure of the *seal* affixed to soldiers and servants, there was a difference in the place upon which it was impressed. The command of God by Ezekiel, to “set a mark upon the foreheads” of his afflicted followers, Dr. Gill thinks to allude probably “to the marking of “servants in their foreheads, by which they were known “who they belonged to.” For the word *mark* in this text, the Septuagint and Tremellius read *sign*, which, either in Greek or Latin, is equivalent to *seal*. In allusion to the same custom substantially, Calasio translates Job xxxvii. 7, “He shall *seal* all men in the *hand*.” With this translation the Septuagint and Vulgate Latin agree. With the same allusion, Blanco White says that the Council of Trent “has converted the sacrament of “Baptism into an indelible *brand* of slavery.”^(s) Now I would propound a few questions. Was the *substance* of an ancient military *seal* affected, by changing its device from a beast to a bird? Was the *substance* of a

(r) See Mr. Walker's Reply, p. 156.

(s) In his 5th Letter against Popery.

Prince's seal affected by writing his name on the *hands* of one generation of subjects or servants, and on the *foreheads* of their children? Was the *substance* of the *seal* affected by changing the letters from square to round, or the words from Hebrew to Samaritan, or the ink from red to green? Has the change of our *seal* from a *cross mark* to a *circular mark* affected those bonds and notes to which it is affixed? Would the substance of our Federal *seal* be affected by undergoing the change which Dr. Franklin recommended? Would Popish baptism be either more or less a brand of slavery, by being administered to the head, the hands, or the feet, in the mode of aspersion, affusion, ablution or immersion? And is it not a fact that the descendants of Ishmael and Isaac have, at this day, the *form* of circumcision without the *substance*? What is there, then, so extravagant in the position that the *form* and the *substance* of a *seal* are distinct things? and what is there so incredible in the doctrine, that a God of sovereignty and mercy, may, in respect of *form*, change the initiatory *seal* of the church from *blood* to *water*, and from the *foot* to the *forehead*, while the *substance* remains the same?

A little unbiassed reflection will shew an intelligent hearer that it is much more to our purpose to prove a *substantial* identity of the Jewish and Christian *seals*, than to prove their *formal* identity. The *substance* is incalculably more important than the *form*. The circumcision of the Samaritans and Ishmaelites had the *form* of the Jewish *seal*; but because it lacked the *substance*, it was no *seal* at all. Unitarian baptism has sometimes the *form* of Christian baptism; but because they

deny justification by faith in the vicarious satisfaction, and the imputed righteousness of a Divine Redeemer, they lack the *substance* of the Christian *seal* ; and the *form* without the *substance* is no more a *true seal* than a counterfeit is *true coin*.

My evidence in favour of the *sigillistical* identity of Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism, shall be drawn from the Scriptures, which shew their common use and signification ; and which substitute the name of one *form* for the other.

POINT I.

The use and signification of Jewish Circumcision and Christian Baptism, will shew that they are the same SEAL in SUBSTANCE, though in different FORMS.

This will appear from three particulars ; that they are both *initiatory seals*, that they are both *signs of justification*, and both *signs and means of sanctification*.

I. THEY ARE BOTH INITIATORY SEALS. If you and I have heard alike, you have understood my Opponent as denying this position in relation to either of these ordinances. To pass over it, therefore, in silence, would not be proper, howsoever generally its truth may be received.

1. *Circumcision was the seal of initiation* to the Jewish church. On this item, I had prepared several texts to lay before you : but it is really too plain to justify me in occupying your time. Is there one of you who doubts that a Gentile was esteemed an alien until he

was circumcised? and is there one who doubts, that from the moment of his circumcision he was esteemed a member? And if there be any one who is stumbled by Gen. xvii. 14, under the apprehension that a native Jew may be a member of the church without circumcision, I would observe that that passage itself is evidently intended to contradict it; and that the word there rendered *cut off*, cannot, from the very nature of the case, mean *exclusion* from privileges already enjoyed, but *preclusion* from privileges which might hereafter be enjoyed; as the same word in the Hebrew and in the Marginal translation of Joshua ix. 23, is used to denote *preclusion* from that bondage on which the subjects had not yet entered. If any one, after this, should still ask, “How can a child be *cut off* from the church before he is a member?” I would ask, “How can a child be *delivered* from *sheol* before he is dead?” and yet the Proverb says “Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell.”(t) Parental duty is here represented as a means of *delivering*, that is, of *preventing* the child from going to hell: so in the other case, parental neglect is represented as a means of *cutting off*, that is, of *preventing* the child from being a church member.

2. *Baptism is the seal of initiation* to the Christian church. With due deference to those who think otherwise, I would humbly maintain the same doctrine, on this item, as on the last. I do not object to saying that children are born in the church; it is a language which

(t) Prov. xxiii. 14. Comp. Ps. xxx. 3. lxxxvi. 13.

I use myself: but then it is used in a general and familiar, and not in a technical sense; or it contemplates the *unsealed* interest which they may have in the promises of God, and not their *formal* church-membership. As the holiness of the one unbelieving parent, amounts to nothing more than a removal of an Old Testament obstacle to the initiation of the child, so the holiness of the child is understood as entitling him to initiation. In relation both to the visible and invisible church, I much like the ancient maxim, “CHRISTIANI NON NASCIMUR SED FIMUS; *We are not born but made Christians.*” As the inward graces of religion distinguish the invisible church from the world; so do the outward sacraments “*put a visible difference between those that belong unto the church, and the rest of the world.*”(u) All that Booth has quoted from ancient fathers and worthies, to shew the necessity of Baptism as a prerequisite for the Eucharist, presupposes that baptism is the seal of initiation. Accordingly, he tells us, in support of his own views, that “Theological writers have often called baptism, the sacrament of *regeneration*, or of *initiation*; and the Lord’s supper, the sacrament of *nutrition.*”(v) My Opponent himself preaches this doctrine, when it seems likely to answer his purpose. His “Fourth reason for asserting” “a radical difference between the two religions and the two churches [of the Old and New Testaments,] is found in the *terms of admission into this new kingdom.*” Under this head, he says, “Nicodemus, ye must be born again; though sprung

(u) Westminster Confession, Chap. 27. Sect. 1.

(v) Booth. Apology. pp. 11. 48.

“ from Abraham, ye must be *born again* ; yes and of wa-
 “ *ter* too, or into Messiah’s realm you’ll never *enter*.”(*w*)
 According to this, a man must be *born again of water*,
 as a *term of admission into*, as the way by which he
 shall *enter*, Christ’s ecclesiastical kingdom ; that is, *Bap-*
tism is the way of initiation into the Christian church.
 After this I need not waste your time with a formal refu-
 tation of his quibbles against this doctrine, nor with an
 exposure of the impious solecism of his Master Robin-
 son, who “ took baptism not for a church ordinance,
 “ but for a profession of Christianity at large ! !”

Although this Infidel writer has been long circulated
 among you by the deluded Baptist preachers of our
 country, he has perhaps never yet persuaded you that
 baptism is not a church ordinance. In your faith and
 practice, you still treat baptism as the initiating church
 ordinance ; and this faith and practice can be traced
 through the line of your fore-fathers, even up to their
 primitive days in Germany. According to STAPFER,
 “ Baptism is, in their view, a *sign of initiation* to the
 “ true church, and of confession.” “ They *initiated*
 “ by *ana-baptism*, those whom they received as citi-
 “ zens of their kingdom.”(*k*)

II. THEY ARE BOTH SIGNS OF PARDON AND JUS-
 TIFICATION. These benefits always presuppose or infer
 each other. Like the foreknowledge and foreordination
 of God, they are *distinct*, but not *separate*. Wherever,

(*w*) Spur. Deb. with me, p. 197. 198.

(*k*) Stapfer’s Institutions. Chap. 18. Sect. 35. 10.——“ baptismus,
 ex mente illorum, sit signum initiationis ad veram ecclesiam, et con-
 fessionis.”——“ eos quos tanquam regni sui cives assumebant, anabap-
 tismo initiabant.”

therefore, I find the one I shall take the other for granted.

1. CIRCUMCISION is a sign of pardon and justification. This is plainly proved by Rom. iv. 11, so often quoted already; which Dr. Gill considers as comprehending pardon along with justification: for he says that “circumcision was a sign of Christ, as all the “ceremonies of the law were, and of the shedding of “his blood, to cleanse from all sin, original and actual, “and also of the circumcision of the heart; and was, “moreover, a seat of the righteousness of faith.” He says that “The Apostle explains it to be a seal, or “what gave assurance to Abraham, or was a sure token “to him, that righteousness would be wrought out by “Christ, by his obedience, and the shedding of his “blood, which is received by faith; and that this was “imputed to him,” &c.(y)

2. BAPTISM is a sign of pardon and justification. “Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, “every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the “remission of sins.” But Paul tells us that God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation “to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins,” “through faith in “his blood;” and the end of this was “that he might “be just, and the justifier of him that believeth.”(z)

III. THEY ARE BOTH SIGNS AND MEANS OF SANCTIFICATION. The ordinances as well as the oracles of God, are intended as means of grace. It does not militate against this position in respect of either, that they

(y) Gill on Gen. xvii. 11.

(z) Acts ii. 38. Rom. iii. 25. 26.

are both sometimes a savour of death unto death. It is sovereign grace which makes the gospel the power of God unto salvation ; and this same grace often connects the outward with the inward circumcision ; the outward washing of regeneration with the inward renewing of the Holy Ghost ; so that the infant is, at the same moment, circumcised in flesh and heart, and born of water, and of the Spirit.

1. CIRCUMCISION *is a sign and means of sanctification.* “And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.”(a) On this subject my Opponent speaks as follows, viz. “Was circumcision a sign of the circumcision of the heart to the whole Jewish nation that fell in the wilderness? Was it the sign of the circumcision of the heart of one of Abraham’s descendants? No, not one. Do, Mr. M’Calla, stop and prove this assertion if you can—that circumcision was a sign of the circumcision of the heart. Don’t assume every thing, don’t beg every question. Have some respect to your hearers, and to the reputation of your own intellect.”(e) This declamation of my Baptist Opponent shews that pride of intellect sometimes makes a man wise above what is written. In relation to many of Abraham’s descendants, it is written, “He is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter.” In relation not only to Abraham, but to his de-

(a) Deut. xxx. 6. Comp. x. 16.

(e) Spurious Debate with me. pp. 204. 205. 226.

scendants, Dr. Gill says, "The only true circumcision is "internal, spiritual, and in the heart." And he expressly says that the "circumcision of the flesh was typical of "this," and again, that it was "an emblem of spiritual "circumcision, or circumcision of the heart."(*f*) Now it will not do to answer this, by begging our worthy and eminent Baptist writer to *have some respect to his readers, and to the reputation of his own intellect.*

2. BAPTISM *is a sign and means of sanctification.* Here the primitive Anabaptists of Germany do not agree with me as they did in a former case: but they were consistent enough to reject the scriptures also from being a means of grace. Their doctrine, according to STAPFER, was as follows viz. "And if perseverance depend "upon man, nor is there need of divine assistance, "hence neither is there need of signs and seals of sealing grace ;(*b*) whence they hold that the sacraments "are only signs of our confession. And since they who "have attained the highest degree of perfection and "sanctity, no longer stand in need of the means of "grace, hence they do not highly esteem the use of the "sacred scripture." In opposition to this erroneous doctrine my Opponent quotes Peter, who says, "Baptism does also now save us, by the resurrection of "Jesus Christ from the dead."(*c*) To this he adds several appropriate authorities, to some of which I have already alluded. By this I do not mean to agree with

(*f*) See Gill on Gen. xvii. 11. Rom. iv. 11. iii. 1. ii. 29.

(*b*) *Hinc nec gratiæ obsignantis signis et sigillis opus est.* Stapfer's Institutions. Chap. 18. Sect. 30. 31.

(*c*) 1 Pet. iii. 21.

my Opponent, in considering baptism more important than faith. He might as well say that sacrifice was better than obedience. This error of his, and the opposite one of his forefathers, both alike flow from ignorance of true religion.

POINT II.

The substitution of the name of one FORM for the other, proves that their SUBSTANCE is the same.

On this subject I would solicit your attention to two verses, one of which has very often passed under your review. “ And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised : that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised ; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also : and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.”(d) By the consent of all parties, this passage represents Abraham as the father of God’s people, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. Here the Jews are not represented as believers and the Gentiles as unbelievers ; both have the same faith, because the faith of the church has undergone no change : but the Jews are represented as circumcised, and the Gentiles as uncircumcised, altho’ Abraham is the Father of circumcision to both ; because, though both have, *substantially*,

(d) Rom. iv. 11. 12.

the same *seal*, they have not the same *form* of the *seal*. As the use of the *abstract* for the *concrete* is a common *Hebraism*, we are here to understand “the father of the *circumcision*” to mean “the father of the *circumcised*.” This will preserve the antithetical relation of the two aspects in which Abraham’s character is here presented. One is, that he was the father of the uncircumcised believers; another is, that he was the father of the circumcised. The sense of one will illustrate the other. Dr. Gill says that the first means that he was the father “of them *as* they were believers,” whether they were Jews or Gentiles. The meaning of the second, then, must be that he is the father of the *circumcision* *as* they were *circumcised*, whether Jews or Gentiles. This is the plain meaning of the passage. The Gentile church is evidently represented as circumcised in one sense, and as uncircumcised in another sense. The two cannot be reconciled on any other principle, than that the substance of circumcision remains under the *form* of baptism after the ancient *form* of the *seal* is abolished.

2. Paul says, “Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision: for *we are the circumcision*, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.(e) In this passage, as in the former, the noun is used for a participle; it means “we are the circumcised.” Why are Christians said to be circumcised? It must be, because they have received *outward*, or *inward* circumcision, or *both*. But my Opponent denies that it ever

(e) Phill. iii. 2. 3.

relates to inward circumcision. He says, "Was it the
 " sign of the circumcision of the heart of one of Abra-
 " braham's descendants? No, not one." Then, of
 course, the word here must mean external circumcision.
 But it cannot mean that form of it which the Jews prac-
 tised ; for that is here called, by way of contempt, *con-*
cision, in allusion to the savage and cruel manner in
 which the heathen cut their flesh : it must, therefore,
 mean some Christian ordinance which, while it does not
 wound the flesh, is *substantially* the same with Jewish
 circumcision, in being a seal of initiation, and a sign of
 justification and sanctification. This ordinance we have
 shewn to be Christian Baptism. To this the text evi-
 dently alludes ; while it certainly does not exclude, but
 primarily intends that spiritual circumcision, the exist-
 ence of which my Opponent is unwilling to admit.

3. " Also ye are circumcised with the circumcision
 " made without hands, in putting off the body of the
 " sins of the flesh, by the *circumcision of Christ*, buried
 " with him in *baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with
 " him, through the faith of the operation of God, who
 " hath raised him from the dead." (f) Here also we find
 circumcision in the Christian church. Yet it was not
 Jewish circumcision, nor that *Judaizing* circumcision
 which the Ebionites practised ; but it is said to be " the
 circumcision of Christ," or *Christian circumcision*.
 Now if my Opponent be correct in denying that there
 is any inward circumcision, and if he be correct in say-
 ing that water-baptism is here intended, then we are

(f) Col. ii. 11. 12.

taught by this passage, that there is an external circumcision, which is not after the *Jewish*, but the *Christian form*; and that this Christian form of circumcision is, “being buried with him in baptism,” as it is correctly translated. The Greek of Griesbach, and the Latin of Castallio have only a *comma* at the close of the eleventh verse. This punctuation only makes a plain truth a little more obvious, that is, that baptism is the Christian circumcision. It is worthy of remark, that this very text was so explained, in a work ascribed to Justin Martyr, who lived very near the time in which Paul wrote it. “The question there, is, *Why, if circumcision were a good thing, we do not use it as the Jews did?*” “The answer is, *We are circumcised by Baptism with Christ’s circumcision, &c.* And he brings this text “for his proof.”(g) In allusion to the same text, both Basil and Chrysostom say that Baptism is the “circumcision made without hands.” And Austin declares it one of the errors of the Pelagians, to “say that in “the baptism of infants, there is no putting off the flesh, “that is, no circumcision made without hands.”(h)

But if, in opposition to my Opponent, you should understand this passage to relate to spiritual circumcision and baptism, as I do, it makes no difference in the conclusion; for the identity of the thing signified is an evident deduction from the *substantial* identity of the outward signs. When the Apostle tells us that the spiritual “putting off the body of

(g) Wall’s History of Baptism. Chap. 2, Sect. 2. From him quoted by the Editor of Calmet’s Dictionary, in his First series of Facts and Evidences on the subject of Baptism.

(h) Wall’s History. Chap. 14. Sect. 1. 2. Chap. 12. Sect. 5.

the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ," is the same as "being buried with him in baptism," does he not evidently teach that they point out the same inward benefits because they are substantially the same ecclesiastical seal? If you can believe that Christian baptism is the Christian circumcision spiritually, then you will not long reject the doctrine that baptism is the *sigillistical* successor and substitute of circumcision.

In reply to this language, my Opponent insists that one thing cannot be a *substitute* for another, unless it completely quadrates, that is, agrees in all points. He then urged what he considered nine points of difference between circumcision and baptism. I then shewed nine points of difference which might easily be found between a drafted militia-man and his hired substitute, who might, nevertheless, be received as a legal substitute, and be esteemed greatly preferable to his principal; as baptism certainly is to circumcision. He then enlarged his list to eleven points, and I mine to twelve. He has now brought them up to fourteen; to which I will add, from other quarters, enough to make them amount to twenty, and concisely notice them in detail. They are as follows, viz.

1. "Circumcision was administered to males only : its substitute then should be confined to males only."

This is an objection urged by all the Baptists; even by Mr. Emlin, who admits that in the text which we last discussed, Paul does speak of baptism as being to Christians, instead of circumcision. Yet he says, "It

does not follow that the subjects of each must be the same ;” and instances in the females. Dr. Wall’s answer to Mr. Emlin will do for my answer to my Opponent. He says, “ It *does* follow that they should be “ the same, except where the gospel-rules do direct an “ alteration ; but St. Paul, discoursing of baptism, (Gal. “ iii. 27. 28.) says, that in respect of it, ‘ there is neither “ ‘ Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, *there is* “ ‘ *neither male nor female,*’ &c. that is, there is no differ- “ ence between them.”(i) Now if he can shew as plain authority for excluding infants, as this is for receiving females, it will be to the purpose.

2. “ Circumcision required not faith in its subject.— Baptism therefore ought not to require faith in its subject.”

To this I answer, that although neither circumcision nor baptism requires faith in an infant subject, yet as they are only different forms of the seal of the righteousness of faith, they surely demand faith in the adult subject, and in the parent or guardian who presents an infant subject. In relation to circumcision, this is proved by the very first administration of it ; and by very many other scriptures, which, as they have already occupied much of your time, need not here be repeated.

3. “ Circumcision was administered according to law on the eighth day. Its substitute then should be administered on the eighth day.”

My Opponent well recollects that this difficulty was agitated in the time of Fidus and Cyprian : but with them it was a difficulty in relation to duty, not doctrine.

(i) Wall’s Defence against Gale, p. 31. 32.

Those who believed baptism on the eighth day obligatory, and those who did not believe it obligatory, both believed it to be the Christian circumcision. As there were no Anabaptists in those days, the doctrine that circumcision and baptism were *substantially* the same seal, was clear enough to the whole church. The only difficulty with Fidus was, to discover the lawfulness of baptizing an infant before he was eight days old. He expressed no doubt of the lawfulness of baptizing a child when he had arrived to that age, or at any subsequent period ; for this was the law of circumcision : but in a Council of sixty Bishops, he could not find one to agree with him, in thinking it unlawful to baptize under the age of eight days. I agree with them, because this limitation of time formed a part of the complicated machinery of Old Testament purifications, as laid down in the twelfth Chapter of Exodus; in the prospect of which it was probably at first commanded. But if you think differently, I would advise to do as Fidus did ~~at~~ baptize on the eighth day and onward, the sooner the better.

4. "Circumcision was administered by parents, not by priests *ex officio*. Baptism, its substitute, ought likewise to be administered by parents, not by priests, or clergy, *ex officio*."

My Opponent, doubtless, knows that his Master, Robinson, asserts "the right of every Christian to enlarge "the kingdom of Christ, by teaching and baptizing "others." You know that my Opponent has followed this Infidel in making baptism every thing, and yet in waging a war of extermination against the whole order

of clergy, as such. If he be correct in denying that baptism is a church-ordinance, then it is of but little importance, to have church-officers to administer it ; nor do I believe that he wishes the existence of a church to observe it. It is plain, however, that this objection about lay-baptism, is, like the preceding one, entirely irrelevant to the question in hand. It may be decided either the one way or the other, without in the least affecting the identity of circumcision and baptism. This will appear from the slightest examination of the subject, and from the fact, that lay-baptism has been advocated and opposed by both Baptists and Pedobaptists, while they still held their peculiar and contrary views, on the question of identity. This argument, however, will serve to increase his numerical force of objections, and to shew his eager desire to destroy the clergy ; for he knows that if he can smite the shepherds, their flocks can be scattered.

5. "Circumcision was a mark made upon, not the face of the subject. Baptism, its substitute, ought not to be performed on the face."

This objection has already been answered ; and I cannot help still thinking, that if an earthly Prince has a right to change a civil or military seal, as to its form, its device, its letters, and its place of administration, such as the hand or the forehead, without altering its substance, then our heavenly Prince has a right to do the same.

6. "Circumcision was not a duty binding upon the child, but upon the parents ; it was an act of the parent, the subject was passive. Baptism, therefore, is not a duty

of the subject, but of the parent ; it is the parent's act, the subject is passive."

It is a pleasant proof of the strength of our cause, when a man of such a fruitful invention, cannot muster fourteen objections to it, without making this pitiful evasion one of them. The whole force of it depends upon the ambiguity of the word *subject*, as it may mean either an infant or an adult. He knows that if he had left out this word, or if he had used it uniformly and exclusively, he would have appeared like a man talking in his sleep. Let us try it first without this ambiguous word. It would read as follows, viz. "Circumcision was not a duty binding upon the *child*, but upon the parents ; it was an act of the parent, the *child* was passive. Baptism, therefore, is not a duty of the *child* but of the parent : it is the parent's act, the *child* is passive." Would not this be a powerful objection to the identity of circumcision and baptism ? It is at least as passive as any child that I ever saw baptized. Now let us read it with the ambiguous word *subject*, uniformly substituted for *child*. "Circumcision was not a duty binding upon the *subject*, but upon the parents ; it was an act of the parent, the *subject* was passive. Baptism, therefore, is not a duty of the *subject*, but of the parent : it is the parent's act, the *subject* is passive." Does my Opponent believe such doctrine as this ? Does he believe that circumcision was not a duty binding upon Abraham its first *subject*, but upon his parents ? Does he believe that it was not binding upon thousands of adult *subjects* who followed him ? If, therefore, it is admitted that, under the Old Testament, unsealed adults were bound to receive circumci-

sion for themselves and their children ; and if, under the New Testament, unsealed adults are bound to receive baptism for themselves and their children, where is the force of his objection against the identity of these ordinances ? All the force that it has goes to prove their identity.

7. "Circumcision" was administered to all a man's slaves; all born in his house and bought with his money. Baptism, therefore, ought to be administered to all the slaves of a householder, as well as to his own seed."

In answer to this, I would observe, that the true doctrine of circumcision was, that this ordinance should be administered to every believer and his infant household; which embraced his own infants, those which he had adopted, and those which were bound to him ; all of which he had an opportunity of *training up* in the way they should go. When Abraham's adult servants were circumcised, there is reason to believe that it was with their own consent, and upon their own profession, (as was the case with the Israelites at Gilgal,) because these servants of Abraham had previously received this *training*. They are expressly called his *trained servants*, before the institution of circumcision :^(j) and the word there used does not appear to relate to *military discipline*, but to *spiritual instruction* and *ecclesiastical initiation* ; as in the Proverb which says " *Train up* a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." All that I have said here concerning household circumcision, is true concerning

(j) Gen. xiv. 14.

household baptism ; as I hope to shew in my argument for infant baptism, from Apostolical practice.

8. “ Circumcision required no piety in the parent to entitle his child to this ordinance ; neither faith nor piety were ever required of a parent to entitle his child to circumcision. Piety or faith ought not then to be demanded as necessary in parents to the baptism of their children.”

I am sorry to say that thousands of Pedobaptists agree with every word of this unscriptural stuff : yet they are so far from thinking it an objection to the doctrine that baptism is the Christian circumcision, that they seriously believe it an argument in its favour. Others, on the contrary, think more correctly, that granting church privileges to those who do not even profess the circumcision of the heart, is a crying sin of both dispensations. These also think that the agreement of the two dispensations, in this feature, is an evidence that circumcision and baptism are the same *seal*.

9. “ Circumcision imported that its subject was entitled to all the promises made to Abraham concerning his natural seed. Baptism, its substitute, therefore, imports that its subject is entitled to a share in all the temporal blessings promised to the seed of Abraham.”

In reply, I would remark, that if either of these propositions be true, then Providence has deprived very many of their rights. Instead of this, I would say that circumcision is a seal of the righteousness of faith, and baptism is the same. We shall then have the Scriptures on our side, as has been already proved.

10. “ Circumcision was a token or sign in the flesh, of

the covenant made in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis ; Baptism, is therefore, a token or sign in the flesh, of the covenant made with Abraham in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis."

I answer, as it has been proved that the best Baptist authorities answer, that the seventeenth chapter of Genesis contains a revelation of the covenant of grace. I moreover answer, that circumcision and baptism are only different forms of the same *sign* or *token* of the one covenant of grace in different administrations. It is possible that the objector here means to renew his insinuation that baptism cannot be a token of the covenant, because it is a watery one. If so, I would again remind him, that the token of the Noachic covenant was a watery one. "I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a *token* of a covenant between me and the earth."(*k*)

11. "Circumcision was not to be performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Baptism, its substitute, is, therefore, not to be performed in these names."

My answer is, that if I believed, with a certain objector, that the second of these adorable persons is not the supreme and eternal God, and that the third had no existence until the day of Pentecost, then I would not baptize in this name. It is for this reason, that some more sincere and consistent Unitarians have actually ceased to baptize in the name of the Trinity. But as this Triune God has instituted circumcision and baptism, and

made them one and the same *seal*, we administer the Christian *form* as he has directed, without knowing or inquiring what words were originally used in the Jewish *form*.

12. "Circumcision was identified with the law of Moses, (John vii. 23.) and shared the same fate. Baptism is, therefore, identified with the law of Moses, and must share the same fate."

I answer, that according to Gill's understanding of the passage referred to, it affords no better argument against the doctrine that baptism is the Christian circumcision, than against the doctrine that the first day of the week is the Christian sabbath. But the whole objection rests upon ground which is perfectly preposterous; that because one form of a seal is abolished, therefore its substitute must be abolished. He might as well say that because a drafted militia-man stays at home, therefore his hired substitute must stay at home.

13. "Circumcision has come to such a crisis that whosoever is circumcised, Christ shall profit him nothing; therefore, baptism, its substitute, will also come, or has now come, to such a crisis, that whosoever is baptized, Christ shall profit him nothing."

I answer, that this is true enough with respect to that baptism which lays a man's conscience perfectly asleep, from the moment of his coming up out of the water. The reason is, that he puts his baptism in the place of Christ, as the Jews put their circumcision in the place of Christ. Therefore, as they reject Christ, he will profit them nothing. But there is one sort of circumcision which has not yet come to that crisis. It is that

which Paul had in view, when he said, “We are the
 “circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and
 “rejoice in Christ, and have no confidence in the
 “flesh.” “In whom also ye are circumcised, with the
 “circumcision made without hands, in putting off the
 “body of the sins of the flesh, by the [*Christian cir-*
 “*cumcision*, or] the circumcision of Christ, [being]
 “buried with him in *baptism*.” This is a sort of cir-
 cumcision in which Christ profits us much; and
 which does not lead his true church to boast that
 their conscience has not troubled them since they re-
 ceived it.

14. “Circumcision did not exempt one of the Jews
 from baptism, when they believed in Christ; there-
 fore, its substitute, baptism, ought not to exempt a
 believer from being baptized again and again.”(1)

My Opponent probably knows that the fact of bap-
 tism having been rightly administered to those who had
 been rightly circumcised, is disputed. I, however, do
 not dispute it. Yet I am far from perceiving the force
 of his objection. It is as much as to say, that because,
 on the change of dispensation, the New Testament form
 of the seal was administered to those who had received
 the Old Testament form which is now abolished, there-
 fore, without a change of dispensation, the form ought
 to be repeated, when there is no abolition to make it ne-
 cessary.

15. Some time after my Opponent had got through
 his fourteen objections, he speaks as follows, viz. “If it

(1) For all these objections, See *Spur. Deb.*, with me, pp. 219. 220.

[the infant] was about to die, one hour before it was eight days old, the Jews would not circumcise it. If baptism came in the room of circumcision, why then do many seem so anxious to have their infants sprinkled before they die!! This is a *fifteenth* contradiction of the doctrine of substitution, in which the practice of the Paido-baptists differs from their principles.”(m)

I could answer this objection by observing that his fifteenth is the same as his third, which I have answered already. My Opponent’s endeavour to multiply objections, by making one serve for two numbers, reminds me of a defence which I once heard before a Session, by a delinquent who was charged with abandoning church ordinances. He very formally said, “I will divide my defence into three parts. The First; The Presbyterians signed a petition to stop the mail on the Sabbath, so that my son in Indiana might be killed by the Indians, and I not hear of it, till it would be a day too late. The Second; The Presbyterians want to join church and state. The Third the same as the first.” Although the Moderator of the Session asked him if it was not through mistake, that he had made “the third the same as the first,” he insisted upon it, and it was so recorded. As I do not expect my Opponent easily to relinquish his fifteenth reason, I have allowed it to him, although it is the same as the third, and although it really does not deserve to be uttered and repeated, any more than the old gentleman’s objection to stopping the mail on the Sabbath.

16. I am reminded by a friend,⁽ⁿ⁾ that my Opponent has urged as one objection, that “Pedobaptists are bound to sprinkle all infants of sprinkled parents.”

As this is the same as the eighth, my answer to it has been given under that number. He might as well object, in the next place, that the Pedobaptists want to join church and state.

17. My Opponent has, moreover, said, “that among the Jews, good and bad alike eat the Passover on the ground of circumcision.”^(o)

In answer to this, I would remind you of the sorrowful confession of pious and candid Baptists, like Mr. Great-rake, who mourn, that good and bad too often eat the Eucharist, on the ground of adult immersion. This fact, therefore, will argue more for than against the sameness of circumcision and baptism.

18. In reply to some of Dr. Mason’s remarks concerning hereditary descent, my Opponent concludes that, according to our system “The children of the flesh are counted for the seed,”^(p) contrary to the Apostle’s declaration that “They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God ; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.”^(q)

To this I answer, that “the children of God” and “the seed” here mentioned, are the members of the invisible church ; and the Apostle’s remark was made to shew that membership in the church invisible was not always according to hereditary descent, among Jews or

(n) Mr. Lowry, in his written abstract, now before me.

(o) Lowry’s Abstract.

(p) Spur. Deb. with me, p. 400.

(q) Rom. ix. 8.

Christians ; although a right to visible church membership descended from parent to child, among both Jews and Christians.

19. In order to help out my Opponent with a round number of objections, permit me to notice one of Mr. Gale's, as reported by Dr. Wall.^(r) It is that Pedobaptists cannot account baptism to be instead of circumcision, because purification of heart and life is instead of it. This, however, is in opposition to my Opponent's doctrine, that it never was "a sign of the circumcision of the heart." Here then, we have two errorists taking directly opposite ways to arrive at the same point. The object of both is, to prove that baptism cannot be the Christian circumcision. With this view, one of them rejects the circumcision of the heart, in order to deprive us of those texts, which shew that spiritual circumcision and spiritual baptism are the same ; but the other boldly asserts the circumcision of the heart, in order that he may make it the sole successor and substitute of the outward form, to the exclusion of baptism, which the scriptures represent as a visible substitute ; while they always teach inward circumcision, both before and after the change of the outward form.

20. But the most powerful objection of all, I have reserved for the last. It is a supposed necessity that a substitute should perfectly "QUADRATE" with its principal. He insists upon it that this *quadrature* must be universal and perfect ; so that if one feature of difference, howsoever minute, can be ascertained between

two things, it is impossible that one of them can be a *substitute* for the other. They must fit one another with as much exactness as the impression on the wax corresponds with the seal ; nay, they must quadrate much more perfectly ; for between some seals and their impressions, you may perhaps find twenty points of difference ; but between a substitute and its principal there must be no point of difference. For this reason it is, that my Opponent has been so anxious to multiply particulars, thinking that every additional one, even though it were a repetition of a former one, made his refutation the more triumphant. He knows moreover, that this principle is at the bottom of every objection which he or any other Baptist has ever urged against the sigillistical identity of circumcision and baptism. Let it once be admitted that a substitute may differ in one point, and in many points from its principal, and be a substitute still, and every objection which they have made will go for nothing. For this reason my Opponent has pressed his doctrine of *quadrations* with remarkable solicitude, confidence and animation. He has literally taught you *quadrations* with both hands, by spreading, or may I say, *spraddling* all his fingers, to shew you that a substitute and its principal must quadrate as exactly as the fingers of the right hand agree with those of the left. But what an unhappy illustration ! Is there no difference between the right hand and the left ? Are there any two hands, or fingers, or teeth, or eyes, in this house, which, when minutely examined, do not differ in more than twenty particulars ? This doctrine is also at war with Mr. Gale's position that purification of heart and life is

instead of circumcision. Is there no difference between an outward sign and an inward grace? But remember that our Saviour himself became a SUBSTITUTE for his people. Is there no difference between holiness and corruption, the Creator and the creature? How would the enemies of his vicarious satisfaction be pleased! how would the gates of hell rejoice, if my Opponent could establish his ambidextral quadrations!!

But without continuing to point so awful a truth against a theory so supremely preposterous, I will refer you to an illustration which may occupy your familiar attention in detail. It is that of a military substitute, of which a slight mention has been made already. You remember that when my Opponent enlarged his objections, so as to number nine points of difference between circumcision and baptism, I produced nine particulars in which a military substitute might differ from his principal, and yet be legally and joyfully recognized as a substitute. You remember that he enlarged his list to eleven, and I mine to twelve. He afterward went on to fourteen, then fifteen, and I have helped him to gather his scattered forces until they amount to twenty. At present, therefore, you will not think it necessary for me to enlarge my list to more than thirty. To spare your time, I shall get over them with all possible speed, even to the neglect of grammatical accuracy. To proceed then; A man who is hired to take the place of a drafted militia-man, who wishes to stay at home, will be cheerfully and correctly recognized, as a true and legal *substitute*, if he should differ from his principal, in being

1 Taller	11 Handsomer	21 Gentler
2 Younger	12 Happier	22 Genteeler
3 Straighter	13 Holier	23 Kinder
4 Stronger	14 Humbler	24 Cleanlier
5 Swifter	15 Hardier	25 Lovelier
6 Sprightlier	16 Honester	26 Chaster
7 Thicker	17 Wittier	27 Meeker
8 Thriftier	18 Soberer	28 Quieter
9 Heavier	19 Graver	29 Wiser
10 Healthier	20 Braver	30 Better

You will observe, that in all these points of difference between the principal and his substitute, there is not one which, in the least, invalidates the vicarious character of the latter; nor one which does not make him superior to his principal. Just so it is with the two forms of our initiatory seal: there is not one feature of difference which disqualifies baptism from serving as a substitute for circumcision; nor one feature which does not make it superior to it. If, therefore, my Opponent could muster thirty points instead of fifteen or twenty, they would only shew the great superiority of the New Testament *form*, to that of the Old Testament, without, by any means, impugning their *substantial* identity.

But I am far from admitting that there are as many points of difference as my Opponent's increasing zeal may choose to enumerate. If he had stopped at five, he would probably have had all that deserve the name. Baptism differs from circumcision, 1. In its being an *as-persion*, or *ablution*, or *affusion* of water, instead of an *effusion* of blood. 2. In its being administered usually to the head, forehead, or face. 3. In its being lawful to

administer it to infants of any age, as well under as over eight days. 4. In its admitting subjects of *both* sexes. 5. In its not requiring a profession of faith in *both* parents. Any person who knows the nature of seals, must see that all these points are merely *circumstantial*; not one of them belonging to the *essence* of a seal. Any one may perceive, moreover, that there is not one of them, which does not make the substitute superior to the original form. My Opponent, therefore, might have spared the remark that I had illustrated the subject by a military substitute, on account of “finding the points of difference between circumcision and baptism so numerous and so glaring.”(s) They are few in number, and indifferently in their nature.

My Opponent would persuade you that the case in question does not deserve an answer: yet it is amusing to see that he is obliged to answer it; and in doing so, is compelled to relinquish his original ground. His words are as follows, viz. “He [M‘Calla] introduces a military substitute instead of a theological one. And this “is not all, nor the worst of it; he draws his conclusion “from the *personal* differences between the substitute “and his principal, and not from any difference in the “performance of the offices or duties, which the substitute is obliged to perform for his principal. Had we “made objection to baptism as a substitute for circumcision, because the one was a *watery* rite, and the “other a *bloody* one, there would have been something “more specious in his sophistry. But we objected to

(s) Spur. Deb. p. 237.

“ the substitute, as differing from the principal, on the
 “ ground of its not performing the offices or duties of
 “ the principal. If a military substitute performs all the
 “ duties incumbent on the principal, he is completely a
 “ substitute, although his person might differ in one
 “ hundred respects from him. Now if baptism perform-
 “ ed all the offices and duties of circumcision, neither
 “ more or less, we would not object to it, as a substitute,
 “ because of its personal or characteristic differences,
 “ already mentioned under the idea of *blood* and
 “ *water*.”(t)

So much for my Baptist Opponent. Now in these remarks, I say, he has made a retrograde movement. In his original ground, he required that the principal and the substitute should *quadrate*, not only *entirely*, but *completely*; not only in their nature and ends, but in their appendages and circumstances. On this ground his first, third, and fifth objection, required that they should both be confined to one sex, both be applied to one part of the body, and both be administered on the eighth day. His fifteenth objection will not admit of the administration of the substitute to a child, “ *one hour* before it was eight days old.” But now he says, “ We
 “ would not object to it as a substitute, because of its
 “ personal or characteristic differences already mention-
 “ ed under the idea of *blood* and *water*.” That is, he would not deny that baptism was a substitute for circumcision, merely “ because the one was a *watery* rite, and the other a *bloody* one.” How can these things be re-

conciled? Is not a change from the shedding of blood to the application of water as important as changing the part of the body to which the seal is applied? Is not a change from blood to water as important as subtracting “*one hour*” from eight days? and is it not as essential as any feature of difference which can be discovered between circumcision and baptism? If so, then all the twenty objections, according to my Opponent’s new principle, have no more weight against the identity of the two rites, than my thirty objections have against the vicarious standing of the military substitute.

But in taking his new ground, my Opponent would persuade you that he has reserved a secure refuge. He says, “If a military substitute performs all the duties “incumbent on the principal, he is completely a substitute, although his person might differ in one hundred “respects from him.” This, however, is so far from being a formidable principle to the Pedobaptists, that it is the very ground upon which their doctrine rests. We admit that the Christian rite differs from the Jewish, in five non-essential particulars, just as one man may differ from another in a hundred non-essential particulars; yet we say that baptism and circumcision have the same essential qualities, as seals; just as these two men may be able to perform the same essential duties, as soldiers. In despite of all my Opponent’s sophistry on this subject, it has been shewn that circumcision is an initiatory *seal*; so is baptism: circumcision is a *sign* of pardon and justification; so is baptism: circumcision is a *sign* and means of sanctification; so is baptism. And while they agree in these essentials, (as it has been proved at large

that they do agree,) they may differ in one hundred particulars, and yet the one may be the substitute of the other, according to my Opponent's own shewing; howsoever contradictory it may be to his exploded doctrine of *quadrations*.

Mr. Gale^(u) says that "the argument for infant baptism from circumcision was not insisted on by those called Ancient Fathers; and though he might have instanced in some of them, who, indeed, do not mention its succeeding circumcision, he unluckily picks out for his only instances St. Cyprian and St. Austin, who are known to have mentioned it; but he says it was not insisted on by them, for aught he finds!" Perhaps a more diligent and candid search would have enabled him to find it. The audience will recollect, that, before I formally commenced the defence of the present proposition, my Opponent was eager to enter upon it; and in doing so, "declared that Calvin and Beza were the first who "argued Infant-baptism from Jewish circumcision."^(v) You recollect how emphatically I called upon you to mark that declaration. Startled at my request, and fearing that exposure which I promised to make, in due time, if Providence allowed, he came forward to support his assertion by what he called a respectable writer. Suspecting from the outside of the pamphlet, as well as from the ignorance and rashness displayed in its contents, that its author was Dr. Fishback of Lexington, I

(u) As reported by Dr. Wall, in his Defence, p. 370. The words quoted are the Doctor's.

(v) Lowry's Abstract of notes taken at the Debate.

called for the name; but my Opponent had, by that time, become so modest, that I could not distinguish what name he announced. However, here we have it in the Doctor, whose pamphlet I have taken the trouble to bring along with me. His words are as follows, viz. “I
 “ had been accustomed to hear it said, that baptism
 “ was established in the Christian church, in the place
 “ of circumcision under the Jewish economy. In
 “ my investigation of the subject, I found that that
 “ opinion was comparatively of a recent date. I could
 “ not find in church-history or any where else, that it
 “ had been introduced earlier than the sixteenth century, and for the first time by Calvin and Beza.”(w)
 While I was proving to you that the early church agreed with the scriptures in calling baptism a *seal*, it became necessary to read some testimonies from the Fathers, which shew, at the same time, that they considered it as coming in the place of circumcision. Notwithstanding this, my Opponent renews his gross assertion, immediately after he had retreated from his *quadrations*, noticed a few minutes ago. He says, “The quotations
 “ read from Dr. Wall’s History does not disprove our
 “ assertion, that Calvin and Beza were the first who introduced baptism in the room of circumcision, in the
 “ sense contended for by Mr. M’Calla.”(x)

As the testimony of the church on this subject, belongs to the fourth general topic, it was my intention to reserve it for that place. Its anticipation, we hope, will be excused, especially as it will occupy very little time.

(w) Fishback’s Letters, p. 69.

(x) Spur. Deb. p. 237.

The evidence is plain, and, strange to tell, it may be found in that very paragraph of Dr. Fishback's book, from which I have just now read an extract. He there informs us that ATHANASIUS, who lived twelve hundred years before Calvin and Beza, says that "*Circumcision* " was appointed on the eighth day, to be a figure of that " regeneration made by *baptism*."

His cotemporary, EPIPHANIUS, says, "The law had " the patterns of things in it; but the truth of them is " in the gospel. The law had the circumcision in the " flesh, serving for a time, till the great *circumcision* " came, that is *baptism*; which circumcises us from our " sins, and seals us unto the name of God."(*y*)

His contemporary, AUGUSTINE, speaks as follows, viz. " Yet we may besides take a true estimate, how much " the sacrament of *baptism* does avail infants, by the " *circumcision* which God's former people received. " For Abraham was justified before he received that, as " Cornelius was endued with the Holy Spirit before he " was baptized: and yet the Apostle says of Abraham, " that 'he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of " the righteousness of the faith,' by which he had in " heart believed, and it had been counted to him for " righteousness. Why then was he commanded thence- " forward to circumcise all his male infants on the eighth " day, when they could not yet believe with the heart, " that it might be counted to them for righteousness, " but for this reason, because the sacrament itself is of " itself of great import?——Therefore, as in Abraham

(*y*) Wall's Hist. Chap. 21. Sect. 5.

“ the righteousness of faith went before, and *circum-*
 “ *cision* the seal of the righteousness of faith came after;
 “ so in Cornelius the spirit of sanctification by the gift
 “ of the Holy Spirit went before, and the sacrament of
 “ regeneration by the laver of *baptism* came after. And
 “ as in Isaac who was circumcised the eighth day, the
 “ seal of the righteous ness of faith went before, and (as
 “ he was a follower of his Father’s faith) the righteous-
 “ ness itself, the seal whereof had gone before in his in-
 “ fancy, came after; so in infants baptized the sacra-
 “ ment of regeneration goes before, and (if they put in
 “ practice the Christian religion) conversion of the
 “ heart, the mystery whereof went before in their body,
 “ comes after.”(z)

AUSTIN, moreover, tells us concerning Chrysostom,
 “ Even he, as well as the martyr Cyprian, teaches, that
 “ the *circumcision* of the flesh was commanded in the
 “ way of a type of *baptism*.” He then quotes the words
 of Chrysostom, which are the same as those of Basil;
 after which he adds, “ You see how this man, establish-
 “ ed in ecclesiastical doctrine, compares circumcision to
 “ circumcision, and threat to threat: that which it is,
 “ not to be circumcised on the eighth day; that it is,
 “ not to be baptized in Christ: and what it is, to be cut
 “ off from his people; that it is not to enter into the
 “ kingdom of heaven. And yet you [Pelagians] say
 “ that in the baptism of infants there is no putting off the
 “ flesh, that is, no circumcision made without hands;
 “ when you affirm that they have nothing which needs
 “ to be put off: for you do not confess them to be dead

“in the uncircumcision of the flesh, by which is meant
 “sin, especially that sin which is derived originally:
 “for by reason of this, our body is the body of sin,
 “which the Apostle says is destroyed by the cross of
 “Christ.”(a)

CHRYSOSTOM says, “But our *circumcision*, I mean
 “the grace of *baptism*, gives cure without pain, and
 “procures to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the
 “grace of the Spirit: and it has no determinate time, as
 “that had; but one that is in the very beginning of his
 “age, or one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in
 “his old age, may receive this circumcision made with-
 “out hands; in which there is no trouble to be under-
 “gone, but to throw off the load of sins, and receive
 “pardon for all foregoing offences.”(b)

AMBROSE says, “For a very good reason does the law
 “command the males to be circumcised in the beginning
 “of infancy, even the bondslave born in the house: be-
 “cause as circumcision is from infancy, so is the disease.
 “No time ought to be void of the remedy, because none
 “is void of guilt.” “Neither a proselyte that is old,
 “nor an infant born in the house is excepted; because
 “every age is obnoxious to sin, and therefore every age
 “is proper for the sacrament.” “The meaning of the
 “mystery is plain. Those born in the house are the
 “Jews, those bought with money are the Gentiles that
 “believed: for the Church is bought with the price of
 “Christ’s blood. Therefore, both Jew and Gentile, and
 “all that believe, must learn to circumcise themselves

(a) Wall’s Hist. Chap. 14. Sect. 2.

(b) Ibid. Chap. 14. Sect. 1.

“ from sin, that they may be saved. Both the home-born
 “ and the foreigner, the just and the sinful, must be cir-
 “ cumcised by the forgiveness of sins, so as not to prac-
 “ tice sin any more: for no person comes to the king-
 “ dom of heaven but by the sacrament of *baptism*.”
 “ You see, he excepts no person, not an infant, not one
 “ that is hindered by any unavoidable accident.”(c)

BASIL, in reference to that text which occasioned the last sentence quoted from Ambrose, speaks as follows, viz. “ A Jew does not delay circumcision, because
 “ of the threatening that every soul that is not circum-
 “ cised the eighth day shall be cut off from his people :
 “ and dost thou put off the *circumcision* made without
 “ hands in putting off the flesh, which is performed in
 “ *baptism*, when thou hearest our Lord himself say,
 “ ‘ Verily, verily, I say unto you, except one be born of
 “ ‘ water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the
 “ ‘ kingdom of God ?’ ”(e)

CYPRIAN, and the rest of the Bishops who were present at the Council, sixty-six in number, in their letter to Fidus, in favour of baptizing a child before he is eight days old, notwithstanding the law of circumcision on that point, argue as follows, viz. “ That the eighth day was
 “ observed in the Jewish circumcision, was a type going
 “ before in a shadow and resemblance, but on Christ’s
 “ coming was fulfilled in the substance. For because
 “ the eighth day, that is, the next to the sabbath day,
 “ was to be the day on which the Lord was to rise from
 “ the dead, and quicken us, and give us the spiritual

(c) Wall’s Hist. Chap. 13. Sect. 2.

(e) Ibid. Chap. 12. Sect. 5.

“circumcision, this eighth day, that is, the next day to
 “the sabbath, or Lord’s day, was signified in the
 “type before; which type ceased when the substance
 “came, and the spiritual circumcision was given to us.
 “So that we judge that no person is to be hindered from
 “obtaining the grace, [or, as it is elsewhere expressed,
 “‘it is not for us to hinder any person from *baptism*,’]
 “by the law that is now appointed: and that the spirit-
 “ual *circumcision* [that is, *baptism*,] ought not to be
 “restrained by the *circumcision* that was according to
 “the flesh: but that all are to be admitted to the grace
 “of Christ; since Peter, speaking in the Acts of the
 “Apostles, says, ‘The Lord hath shewn me that no per-
 “son is to be called common or unclean.’”(f)

JUSTIN MARTYR says, “We also who by him have
 “had access to God, have not received this carnal cir-
 “cumcision, but the spiritual *circumcision*, which
 “Enoch, and those like him observed. And we have
 “received it by *baptism*, by the mercy of God, because
 “we were sinners: and it is enjoined to all persons to re-
 “ceive it by the same way.” A work entitled “Ques-
 “tions to the Orthodox,” is ascribed to Justin Martyr.
 My Opponent, in his spurious publication against Mr.
 Walker,(g) recognizes its authenticity. In answer to
 the question, why, if circumcision were a good thing,
 we do not use it as well as the Jews did; the answer by
 Justin is, “We are circumcised by *Baptism* with *Christ’s*
circumcision.”(h)

Thus is this doctrine clearly traced from Augustine

(f) Wall’s Hist. Chap. 6. Sect. 1.
 (h) Wall’s Hist. Chap. 2. Sect. 1. 2.

(g) p. 103.

back to Justin Martyr, who lived in the second century, immediately after the Apostles, from whom, as we have already shewn, they received it. Dr. Fishback professes to make some quotations from Wall's History of Baptism, in which they are interspersed, and from which I have now read them. If he has read the whole of this work, he could well say, "I had been accustomed to hear it said, [even by the early Fathers] that baptism was established in the Christian church, in the place of circumcision under the Jewish economy." But instead of tracing it to the ancient Fathers, this man of deep research says "In my investigation of the subject, I found that that opinion was comparatively of a recent date. I could not find in church history, [not even in Wall's History,] or any where else, [not even in the writings of the Ancients themselves,] that it had been introduced earlier than the sixteenth century, and for the first time by Calvin and Beza." And my Opponent echoes the declaration of his respectable writer, by saying, "The quotations read from Dr. Wall's History does not disprove OUR ASSERTION that Calvin and Beza were the first who introduced baptism in the room of circumcision, in the sense contended for by Mr. McCalla."

If my Opponent were to deny, as he did with Mr. Walker, that this doctrine was urged by the Fathers as a professed argument in proof of a divine command for Infant-baptism, that would be another thing. The truth is, they had no one to argue with on this subject. Even Tertullian himself, who was opposed to baptizing infants, still admitted that there was a divine command for bapti-

zing them : as I hope to shew under the fourth Topic of this discussion.

After your hearing my sentiments and the sentiments of the Christian Fathers so distinctly, it is perhaps difficult for you to imagine what my Opponent means, when he pretends that their view of this doctrine is different from “the sense contended for by Mr. M‘Calla.” If these be not words spoken at random, I would conjecture that he may refer to their imitation of the Apostle Paul, in speaking of the Christian church as a spiritual and even celestial dispensation, of which the Jewish church was, in a certain sense, only a figure. Circumcision is called “a *figure*” of baptism, by Athanasius. Epiphanius calls it a *pattern*. Chrysostom, as reported by Austin, calls it a *type*. Cyprian calls it “a *type* going before in a *shadow* and *resemblance*.” This, however, is owing to the superior spirituality of the Christian dispensation; for which reason, Paul calls the New Testament church, “Jerusalem which is above.”(i) For this reason, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Basil, call baptism, the circumcision made without hands; and Cyprian and Justin Martyr call it the spiritual circumcision: or rather the latter of these, who lived before them all, says, “We have received it by baptism.” Epiphanius calls baptism “the *truth* of” circumcision. Cyprian calls it “the *substance*” of circumcision. They all used this language, however, not to deny that the one has come in the place of the other, but to express that doctrine; because every one knows that now, the substance has come in

(i) Gal. iv. 26.

place of the shadow, and the anti-type in the place of the type. And that they do this in the sense in which I understand Paul's words, where he calls baptism the circumcision of Christ, is evident from the fact that several of them give my explanation to that text; besides which Chrysostom calls *our circumcision, the grace of baptism*; and Justin expressly says, "We are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision." While they thus considered them the same in *substance*, it has been already shewn that they considered circumcision a *seal*, and baptism a *seal*. They evidently therefore held the doctrine of the proposition now under discussion, from ten to fifteen hundred years before Calvin and Beza came on the stage.

After what has been said, we shall consider it certain, because it has been proved to be true, that there is a real distinction between the substance of a *seal*, and the form of a *seal*; that circumcision and baptism are denominated a *seal* by the scriptures and the early church; that they are both the initiatory seal of the church in their respective dispensations; that they are both signs of pardon and justification; and both signs and means of sanctification; that Christians are called the circumcision; and that baptism is called the circumcision of Christ; that the real points of difference are comparatively few, and these relating to the form, and not to the substance, and therefore not forbidding the substitution of baptism for circumcision, any more than a superiority in health, stature, activity, and bravery, would forbid the acknow-

ledgment of a military substitute ; and that this doctrine, so far from being invented by Calvin and Beza, is as old as Christian baptism itself. It has been also shewn that the truth of this proposition, as well as the former, is ratified by the great Dr. Gill, who, in speaking of the covenant, doctrines, and ORDINANCES of the New Testament, says, “There have been THE SAME THINGS FOR “SUBSTANCE in former ages.” “These, in some sense, are all old things, and indeed are THE SAME IN SUBSTANCE.”(a) We shall, therefore, consider it as proved that Jewish circumcision before Christ, and Christian baptism after Christ, are one and the same *seal* IN SUBSTANCE, though in different forms.

PROPOSITION IV.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THIS SEAL TO INFANTS WAS ONCE ENJOINED BY DIVINE AUTHORITY ; THAT IS, GOD ONCE COMMANDED IT.

It has already been shewn that Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God ; that the Christian church is a branch of the Abrahamic church ; or, in other words, the Jewish society before Christ, and the Christian society after Christ, are one and the same church in different administrations, and that Jewish circumcision before Christ, and Christian baptism after Christ, are one and the same seal in substance, though not in form. The command for ad-

(a) Gill on Eccles. i. 9.

ministering this seal to infants is contained in the following words, viz. “ This is my covenant which ye shall “ keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee ; “ every man-child among you shall be circumcised. “ And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and “ it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and “ you.” “ And the uncircumcised man-child, whose “ flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall “ be cut off from his people ; he hath broken my covenant.(j) Now, as the particular form here enjoined, has been abrogated, while the substance of the seal continues under the form of baptism ; and as we have no more right to *decline obeying* a divine command, than we have to *invent* a religious ordinance, this command must remain obligatory until it is repealed ; and if it has not yet been repealed, it is now binding ; so that my first argument for infant-baptism, drawn from a divine command, will stand good. That it is not repealed, then, will be the subject of fifth and last proposition.

PROPOSITION V.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THIS SEAL TO INFANTS HAS NEVER SINCE BEEN PROHIBITED BY DIVINE AUTHORITY ; THAT IS, THIS COMMAND OF GOD, ORIGINALLY GIVEN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, IS NOT REPEALED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, BUT RATHER CONFIRMED.

As I have already exposed every thing of my Opponent's, which could be considered an effort to prove a

(j) Gen. xvii.* 10. 11. 14.

repeal of this command, I shall proceed immediately to point out some of those New Testament authorities, by which it is rather confirmed than repealed. In doing this, we shall consider, 1. The membership of infants. 2. The holiness of infants. 3. The discipleship of infants.

POINT I.

Our Saviour so recognizes the CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP of infants, as to confirm the command for administering to them the initiatory seal of the church.

“ And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them: but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God,” or “ the kingdom of heaven,” as another Evangelist reads it.^(k)

There is great diversity of opinion concerning the scope of this passage. Some think it chiefly intended to teach that all infants are in a state of guiltless purity; that they are neither corrupt, nor deserving of punishment; and that they will, of course, go to heaven, either through their own innocence, or the atonement of Christ, for a sin which, in their view, did not deserve punishment: thus teaching that we are not depraved and guilty in Adam, and that Christ’s atonement was for innocent people, who did not need it.

In opposition to this opinion, Dr. Gill remarks, that little children “ may be chosen of God, redeemed by the

(k) Luke xviii. 15, 16. Matt. xix. 14.

“ blood of Christ, and have the passive work of the Spirit on their souls, and so enter into heaven ; but this “ is not the sense of this text.” The Doctor observes, that “ It is as if our Lord should say, Don’t drive away “ these children from my person and presence ; they are “ lively emblems of the proper subjects of a *gospel-church state*, and of such that shall enter into the kingdom of heaven : by these I may instruct and point out “ to you, what converted persons should be, who have “ a place in *my church below*, and expect to enter into “ my kingdom and glory above.(l)

If I understand the Doctor in these remarks, he admits that by “ *the kingdom of God*,” and “ *the kingdom of heaven*,” our Saviour meant “ *my church below*,” “ *a gospel church-state* ;” as preparatory to eternal happiness above. Even when our Saviour says, “ My kingdom is not of this world,” Gill very properly understands him to mean “ His mediatorial kingdom,” which “ includes *the whole gospel dispensation, Christ’s visible church-state on earth*, and the whole election of “ grace.”(m) That the expression in this place does mean the visible church, is admitted in my Opponent’s eighth argument against the ecclesiastical identity of the Jewish and Christian societies.(n) The same general statement may be made concerning John’s preaching, “ Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” “ By which is meant not the kingdom of glory to be expected in another world,” says Dr. Gill ; “ It is the

(l) Gill on Matt. xix. 14.
(n) Spurious Debate, p. 229.

(m) Gill on John xviii. 36.

“gospel dispensation which was about to take place,” says the Doctor; and this interpretation my Opponent makes the foundation of his second argument.^(o) Moreover, our Saviour tells us that ever since the time of John, “The kingdom of God is preached.” “The gospel dispensation,” says Gill. The visible church-state, says my Opponent’s third argument.^(p) These facts are intended to shew that the Pedobaptist understanding of this important phrase “the kingdom of heaven,” is conceded by the greatest Baptist commentator, and the most zealous Baptist Polemic in the world: and remember that the Commentator has admitted this interpretation in the very text now in hand, in which he says that the expression means the “gospel church-state,” “my church below.” Embody the commentary in the text, and how will it read? “Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is MY CHURCH BELOW.”

This is evidently the import of other passages containing the same expression. Our Saviour said to the Jews, “*The kingdom of God* shall be taken from you, “and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.”^(q) As the Jews and their children were admitted to church privileges, this threat indicated that they and their children should be deprived of church privileges: and when he promises to transfer these privileges to the Christian church, where is the word which says, “The promise is NOT unto you and to your children?”

(o) Spur. Deb. p. 197. See Matt. iii. 2. and Gill on it.

(p) Gill on Luke xvi. 16. Spur. Debate, p. 197.

(q) Matt. xxi. 43.

Again, "I say unto you, that many shall come from
 "the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham
 "and Isaac and Jacob in *the kingdom of heaven*; but
 "the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into ut-
 "ter darkness."(*r*) On this passage, Dr. Gill correctly
 remarks that "the kingdom of heaven" means "The
 "church of God, which is his kingdom on earth." When
 Jews sat in this kingdom, their infants sat with them,
 by express permission from the king himself. His
 language then was, "Suffer little children to come
 "unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the
 "kingdom of heaven." When this great Head of
 the church appeared in the flesh, to commence a new
 administration of this same kingdom, did he tell them
 that a rejection of infants was one of its features? His
 language still was, "Suffer little children to come unto
 "me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom
 "of God," "my church below."

This conclusion which is inevitable, Dr. Gill endeavours to avoid, by resorting to the Persic, Arabic, and Syriac translations; the last of which is far the most ancient, and the one on which he most relies; as he considers the first of them "rather *paraphrasing* than *translating*."(*s*) From this he endeavours to shew that the persons of whom our Saviour speaks as composing his church below, were not real infants, but such adults as resembled infants. The importance of our resembling infants, is a sentiment which is certainly contained in both the Old and New Testaments :(*t*) yet this is so far

(*r*) Mat. viii. 11. 12.

(*s*) Gill on Mat. xix. 14.

(*t*) Ps. cxxxix. 2. Matt. xviii. 1—6. Mk. x. 15.

from militating against the church-membership of infants, either among Jews or Christians, that it is an argument in its favour. If adults ought never to be initiated until they resemble infants, then the fitness of infants for initiation is taken for granted.

But let us see what assistance Dr. Gill has obtained from the Syriac version, in proving that it is adults, and not infants, who belong to the church. A little labour and attention in examining and comparing different passages of that version, with what he has said about them, will shew that he has refuted himself. In Matt. xix 14, the Syriac reads, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of those who are, *DAIK ELIN*,^(u) *such as these*, is the kingdom of heaven." In Mark ix. 37. it reads, "Whosoever shall receive *AIK ENA*,^(v) *as this* little child, in my name, receiveth me." In Mark x. 14. this Version reads "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of those who are, *DAIK ELIN*, *such as these*, is the kingdom of God." I wish it noticed that this passage reads, *DAIK*, *such as*, and the preceding passage reads, *AIK*, *as*, but that Dr. Gill reads *AIK*, *as*, in both texts, and in both he renders it by the word *like*, which alteration and mistranslation are both more favourable to his views, than if he had recorded and translated it with perfect accuracy. It may be, however, that he considers *AIK* and *DAIK* synonymous. If so, we shall take him at his word, and explore only one of them to ascertain the force of both. But do not think that I shall weary you with many exam-

(u) דאין עלין

(v) איך הנא

ples : two or three must suffice. The little Lexicon of Gutbirius explains 'DAIK by the Latin word TALIS, *such as*, and refers to Matt. ix. 8. to prove it. Here the Syriac Version is as follows : “ But when this multitude saw, they feared and glorified God, that he had “ given power, DAIK ENA, *such as this*, to the sons “ of men.” This was occasioned by our Saviour’s healing “ the sick of the palsy ;” an outward miracle intended to set forth his omnipotent energy in healing our inward diseases ; just as our Saviour held up infants to the view of his disciples, to set forth the necessity of the new-birth. But the question is, what power the multitude meant, in the view of the Syriac Translators, when they spoke of a “ *power such as this*” act of healing ? Did they mean the outward miracle, or the inward grace ? That they meant the latter, no man from Syria, Persia, or Arabia, is simple enough to believe : if they meant the former, Dr. Gill’s whole fabric of Syrian resemblances tumbles to pieces. On this subject every man of common sense is compelled to adopt one opinion, and Dr. Gill among the rest, as may be seen in his Commentary. If, then, when the multitude spoke of “ *power, DAIK ENA, such as this,*” they meant literally, the power of working miracles, and not figuratively, the power of saving souls, which *resembled* it ; let us then be consistent, and interpret such expressions literally of infants, and not confine them by figures, to professing adults, because they *resemble* infants. This therefore settles the meaning of Dr. Gill’s parallel passage, just now quoted ; “ Whosoever shall receive *as this* little child in my name, receiveth me.” There is also

another association between the two passages which need not be overlooked. In Matt. ix. 8. there is a Latin Translation of the Syriac which reads "POTESTATEM "HUJUSMODI," for, "*power such as this*;" where the literal miracle, and not the figurative grace, is confessedly intended. So in Mark. ix. 37. the ancient Vulgate Latin says, "Whosoever shall receive one, EX "HUJUSMODI PUERIS, *of children of this sort*;" that is, real, literal, and not figurative children.

One more example will shew that Dr. Gill refutes himself. It is Jas. iv. 16. The Syriac reads, "Ye "glory in your inflations: all glorying, DAIK ENA, *such "as this*, is from evil;" The Dr. refers to the Syriac of this passage, but, forgetting his doctrine of resemblances, he gives these Syriac words precisely the same rendering which our English Translators have given to the original Greek. Instead of saying "all rejoicing *like this*," he says, "all *such* rejoicing." Why could he not understand the Syriac of Mark ix. 37. in the same way? "Whosoever shall receive one of *such* "children in my name." And why could he not thus interpret the same word, in Matt. xix. 14, and Luke xviii. 16. where the word *children* is confessedly implied, and where there is only a little addition of the characteristic verbosity of the Syriac language?

It is vain to contend that the authors of the Syriac Version had doubts about the application of these passages to infant-baptism, when Tertullian himself, the boast of the Baptists, admitted that it was a command to this effect, although he became so wise as to dispute the propriety of obeying it. In advocating the delay of bap-

tism in the case of unmarried and bereaved believers, (a whim of his own,) he says, “PRECIPUE TAMEN CIRCA “PARVULOS ; *but especially concerning little ones ;*” the very name which Jerome gives to the children which our Saviour blessed. Then Tertullian, knowing that this passage lay in his way, observes, “AIT QUIDEM “DOMINUS, NOLITE ILLOS PROHIBERE AD ME VENIRE. “*The Lord indeed saith, Forbid them not to come unto “me :*” a prohibition, the application of which to infant-baptism he never once denies, but only urges prudential reasons for delaying obedience, “SI NON TAM “NECESSE, *except when absolutely necessary.*”

As Robinson, in his History of Baptism, saw that this testimony was fatal to his cause, he directed his artillery against our understanding of the word, PARVULOS, *little ones*, pretending that it meant adults. After all Dr. Gill’s ingenuity on the subject of resemblances, he found that the Syriac could not help him out, if those were real infants whom our Saviour blessed. He thinks that there is evidence in the little Greek pronoun, *αυτα, them*, in Luke xviii. 16. “which shews that these infants were “not *new born babes*, or *children at the breast*, but “such as were more *grown up*, since they were capable “of being called to, and of coming to Christ.” In opposing this flimsy conceit, I need not lay much stress upon the Ethiopic Version which he confesses is pointedly against him ; I shall be satisfied with proving that the infallible original, to which he has appealed, is against him. If it can be shewn that these children were not adults, then our Saviour’s calling, *αυτα, them*, unto him, will shew that he expected the call to be an-

swered by those parents who brought them to him, or those disciples who forbade them.

In Luke xviii. 15. it is said, “ And they brought un-
 “ to him also, *τα βρεφη, infants.*” In the next verse, Jesus
 says, “ Suffer, *τα παιδια, little children,* to come unto me.”
 Now the question is, what do *Brephos* and *Pais* mean?
 In making out an answer, it would be well to follow a
 rule which Dr. Ryland, an eminent Baptist controversialist of England, has expressed as follows, viz. “ Every
 “ word should be taken in the primary, obvious, and or-
 “ dinary meaning, unless there be something in the
 “ connexion or in the nature of things which requires
 “ it to be taken otherwise.”(w) And here let it be ob-
 served, that in the time of Hesychius, the ancient Glos-
 sographer, “ the primary, obvious and ordinary mean-
 “ ing” of *Pais* was so decidedly *child*, that he did not
 define it, but took this meaning for granted in his expla-
 nation of, *παιδισχοι, boys*, which he said were “ *οι εκ*
 “ *παιδων εις ανδρας μεταβαινοντες, those who are changing*
 “ *from children to men.*” One reason of the wonder
 expressed on the occasion of “ *the children, τους παιδας,*”
 crying in the temple, was their tender age; for they
 were called “ babes and sucklings.”(x) The age, how-
 ever, of those who suffered under Herod, cannot be
 easily mistaken, since it is said that he “ sent forth and
 “ slew, *παντας τους παιδας, all the children,* that were in
 “ Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, *from two*
 “ *years old and under.*”(y)

(w) Taylor's 4th Letter to a Deacon of a Baptist Church. p. 28.

(x) Matt. xxi. 13. 16.

(y) Matt. ii. 16.

As to the word *Brephos*, Symmachus renders Ps. viii. 2, “Out of the mouth *of babes*, βρεφῶν, and sucklings, “thou hast perfected praise.” He, of course, meant literal infants, as Dr. Gill admits that “the Jewish writers generally so understand it;” though the Doctor himself very sagely confines it to adults, notwithstanding the authority of the New Testament, which applies it to infants. The New Testament gives farther evidence of this, in what the Martyr Stephen says concerning the cruelty of the Egyptians to the Israelites. He says that “they cast out τα βρεφῆ ἁντρῶν, *their young children*.”(z) A reference to the first chapter of Exodus will shew that these were what Peter calls “ἀγεγεννητα βρεφῆ, *new-born babes*.”(a) Our new-born Redeemer was twice called “BREPHOS, *the Babe*, lying in a manger.”(b) John the Baptist is twice called “BREPHOS EN TE KOILIA, *the unborn infant*.”(c) The use of it in Apocryphal writings is to the same end. In the Maccabees, it is said concerning children lately circumcised, that the Officers of Antiochus “hanged, τα βρεφῆ, *the infants*, about their necks.”(d) For administering circumcision in another instance, the Officers of Ptolemy are said to have led the captive mothers round about the city, “τα βρεφῆ, *the babes*, hanging at their breast.”(e) And in Ecclus. xix. 11, it denotes an infant as yet unborn. Damm, in his Homeric Lexicon, shews that both these meanings of the word are in accordance with Classical usage: and the Editor of Calmet’s Dictionary has shewn that “the primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning” of BREPHOS,

(z) Acts vii. 19.

(c) Luke i. 41. 44.

(a) 1 Pet. ii. 2.

(d) 1 Mac. i. 61.

(b) Luke ii. 12. 16.

(e) 2 Mac. vi. 10.

according to Eustathius and Phavorinus, is, “*A new-born child, nourished by the teat, from his birth, until he be four years old.*” Dr. Wall has shewn(*w*) that Mr. Gale’s supercanonical book of the fourth century, called *Clement’s Constitutions*, produces this text in support of infant baptism, as follows, viz. “Baptize your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God; for he says, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.’” And the author of a “*Defence of the Waldenses*,”(*o*) has quoted their interpretation of this text, as exhibited in their own Confession of Faith, presented at different periods to Ladislaus and Ferdinand, kings of Bohemia, in which this language occurs, viz. “Likewise they teach that children are to be baptized, and to be consecrated to Christ, according to his word, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.’”

Seeing that Inspired usage, and Classical and Apocryphal usage harmonize in proving that these words denote literal infants; and seeing that the Primitive church and that of the Waldenses considered the text in question as authorizing infant-baptism; then we are bound by Dr. Ryland’s own rule, to believe that *infants* must be here intended, according to “the primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning, unless there be something in the connexion or in the nature of things, which requires it to be taken otherwise.” In the present case,

(*w*) Defence against Mr. Gale, p. 45.

(*o*) Page 48.

however, both the connexion and the nature of things are in our favour. With regard to the doctrine of resemblances, would it not be as well to hold up lambs or doves to the audience, and say, “of such is the church below,” meaning, “of such adults as resemble these lambs or doves in innocence?” But suppose that they were Dr. Gill’s adults instead of infants, who were set forth to the audience. Then it would mean, “of such adults as resemble these adults, is my church below.” But let us see how the connexion supports this interpretation. Is it said that these persons came to Christ themselves? No, their parents brought them; “and his disciples rebuked those that brought them,” from the apparent impropriety of obtruding children, such as Ignatius was at that time, (for he is said to have been one of these infants,) upon the attention of one who was so much occupied with adults. But the context says, moreover, that “he took them up in his arms,” or, as the Syriac says, “upon his arms,” or, “into his bosom,” according to the Ethiopic and Persic translations, as reported by Dr. Gill: so that the context and exigency of the case conspire with the best usage and the most authentic definitions, to prove that our Saviour held literal infants in his arms, and that, of such literal infants, he declared his “church below” to be composed. If then, they be members of the Christian church, they became so, by receiving baptism, the initiatory seal; wherefore, instead of a repeal of the Old Testament law on this subject, we here have an evident confirmation of it.

POINT II.

An inspired Apostle so recognizes the SEMINAL HOLINESS of infants, as to confirm the command for administering to them the initiatory seal of the church.

“ For the unbelieving husband is *sanctified* by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is *sanctified* by the husband : else were your children unclean ; but now “ are they *holy*.”(f)

In common with Pedobaptists in general, I am conscientiously convinced, that the holiness here attributed to the infants of believers, is that seminal holiness which entitles them to the initiatory seal of the church. But as this is warmly and pertinaciously disputed by the advocates of other sorts of holiness, I am willing, with the leave of my hearers, to give a candid and patient attention to every interfering claim. If, then, ecclesiastical holiness be not here intended, what sort was intended ? Was it spiritual holiness, or domestic holiness, or civil holiness ? Let us examine their respective claims.

1. *Spiritual holiness*. Might I not say that this interpretation is quashed by matter of fact ? as also, by what the scriptures say of the small proportion of those who are sanctified from their birth, whether one or both parents professed religion. On this subject, I agree with a remark of my Opponent, in his spurious publication against Mr. Walker,(g) where he says, “ If, then, their “ sin or sins, previous to sprinkling, had been forgiven “ them, they would have had all their sins forgiven

(f) 1 Cor. vii. 14.

(g) p. 175.

“ them, and would have led lives quite different. They
 “ would have been sanctified as well as pardoned : for
 “ pardon, justification, sanctification, and salvation, are
 “ inseparably connected.”

2. *Domestic holiness.* Dr. Macknight, who misses very few opportunities of declining from the good old way, thinks that each of the parties is sanctified or made fit, by his own affections, to live with the other : else were their children unholy ; that is, their parents would not love, nor (on that account,) feed and educate them. One of the most imposing of his remarks in support of this theory, is, a very plausible insinuation that the holiness of the children depends “ on their parents living together.” This, like a thousand other things of his, is a mere figment of his own fancy. So also is his pretending that a separation of the parents would deprive the children of food and education. Is this the conduct of a believing father, when deserted by an idolatrous wife ? or would the scriptures have sanctioned a separation attended with such consequences ? As there was a want of evidence in his Commentary and note, he refers for additional light to his Essay 4th, Section 38th, where he shews that the word *common* means *unclean* ; a thing which no one denies. He refers also to the 53d Section of the same Essay, where he endeavours to prove that the word *sanctify* has the desired meaning, by referring to 1 Cor. vii. 14, the very text in question ; thus reasoning in a circle, by making the Essay prove the note, and the note the Essay.

3. *Civil holiness.* As the former interpretation related to the domestic comforts of the married state, this

relates to the lawfulness of marriage, as a civil transaction. It is as old as the seventeenth century ; for it was then urged by the Anabaptists, in their public Debate with Doctor Featley.^(h) The amount of it is this ; that the *sanctification* of the parents to each other, is simply their *marriage* to each other ; and the *holiness* of the children is simply their *legitimacy*. Dr. Gill espouses this scheme very decidedly ; and rests his whole defence of it, upon “ *the Misnic, Talmudic, and Rabbinic writings!!!*” From these he gives a long quotation, in which he correctly asserts that “the word which is used to *sanctify*, or be *sanctified*, in the Hebrew language, is used to *espouse*, or be *espoused*, no less than ten times.” He professes to give this extract “instead of a thousand that might be produced.” Does not this armament loom as formidably as the Spanish Armada? But there is something else belonging to Spain which can match it exactly. The writings of Popes and Cardinals, Bishops and Monks, are to the Roman Catholics, as the Misnical, Talmudical, and Rabbinical writings are to the Jews, and, (in the present pinch,) to Dr. Gill: and, mark it well, that the Jewish writers are not more clear in converting *sanctification* into *marriage*, than the Popish writings are, in converting *marriage* into *sanctification*, or, into a *sacrament*. Now it would have been very easy for Dr. Gill to produce from a Popish writer, one passage, in which *marriage* was called a *sacrament* ten times ; and to give this instead of a thousand that might have been produced.

(h) See the 8th page of the Doctor's account of that combat.

Why, then, does not Dr. Gill believe *marriage* to be a *sacrament*, as well as that *sanctification* is *marriage*? The evidence for both is much the same, as to weight and respectability. The one is supported by the traditionary legends of Jewish Rabbi's, written several hundred years after Christ; the other is supported by the traditionary legends of Popish Doctors, written several hundred years after the Apostles. The one is supported, as Dr. Gill says, by the writings of Jerome, a Christian Father; the other is supported, as the Papists say, by Jerome's Latin Vulgate, in Eph. v. 32, where he expressly says, concerning *marriage*, "SACRAMENTUM HOC MAGNUM EST, *this is a great sacrament.*" Here we have Jerome and the Rabbi's for the Baptist error, and Jerome and the Doctors for the Popish error; all of them living and writing several hundred years after the Apostles, and having no more right to an arbitrary dictation in sacred criticism, than Dr. Gill or the Pope. For this I have the authority of Dr. Gill himself; for although he pleads Jewish inventions, to relieve him from a New Testament authority, which they have never expounded, yet he refuses to follow them in the very same view of an Old Testament text which they have explained. While he is endeavouring to prove that Paul's *sanctification* means *marriage*, he strengthens his cause by saying, "So the Jews interpret the word *sanctified*, in Job. i. 5. *he espoused to them wives.*" Yet when you turn over to the Doctor's commentary upon Job. i. 5. you find that he pays no attention to these Jewish *espousals*, but *espouses* him-

self the Christian interpretation of the passage, in such a manner as to favour our cause in more respects than one.

On this subject, I have a question to propose to the learned world. I wish information. If marriage is intended in 1 Cor. vii. 14. then I ask, Is there another instance to be found, in the Greek Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation, where the object is governed by the preposition *en* ? In the present text, the supposed marrying verb is in the Passive voice, and the object in the dative case, governed, not by the verb, but by the aforesaid preposition. We have marrying verbs in the *passive*, in Mk. x. 12. Rom. vii. 4. Gen. xx. 3. Deut. xxi. 13. xxii. 22. but these verbs govern the object in the *dative*, without an intervening preposition. We have such verbs in the *active*, in Is. lxii. 5. Deut. xxv. 5. with which you might collate Ecclus. xxv. 8. 16. 2 Macc. i. 14. but these verbs also govern the dative of the object, without an intervening preposition. We have, moreover, such verbs in 1 Chr. ii. 21. Neh. xiii. 23. Matt. v. 32. xix. 9, 2ice. Mk. vi. 17. x. 11. Luke xiv. 20. but they all govern the accusative without an intervening preposition. If, therefore, we may judge by the style of the Apostles, and Evangelists, and Alexandrian Jews, who formed the style of the whole nation, it is extremely improbable that Paul meant *marriage*, when, in the text under review, he spoke of *sanctification*; especially, when *sanctification* does not signify *marriage* nor *legitimacy* in any other place in the whole scriptures.

But Dr. Gill well knew, that after the Apostles were dead, and his Jewish Rabbi's of a later date came on the

stage, they cultivated an invincible hostility, not only to the New Testament, but to their own most venerable Septuagint, because it was so eminently useful in illustrating and supporting the New Testament. It was after this invidious apostacy from the ancient style of their nation, that they began to call *marriage, sanctification* : but as this usage is a mere innovation, perfectly unknown in the Old or New Testament, it is of no more authority in controlling sacred criticism, than is a newspaper published last year in Modern Greek.

Let us, therefore, turn to an unadulterated Hellenist of the first Century, and ask how he would understand the text. “For the unbelieving husband is sanctified “by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by “the husband : else were your children unclean ; but “now are they holy.” That he would never conjecture that marriage and legitimacy were here intended, is evident from this important consideration ; that he had never before heard such language with such a meaning. Notwithstanding this, the language would be perfectly familiar, and the meaning perfectly obvious. Every part of the Old Testament, and every part of Jerusalem and Judea brings consecrated things to his view. There he sees a *holy* land and ground ;(*i*) *holy* mountains and hills ;(*j*) *holy* cities and houses, chambers, instruments, and vessels ;(*k*) *holy* tithes and first-fruits, gifts, offerings, oblations, and portions ;(*l*)

(*i*) Zech. ii. 12. Ex. iii. 5.

(*j*) Is. xxvii. 13. Ps. xcix. 9.

(*k*) Is. lxiv. 10. 1 Chr. xxix 3. Ez. xlii. 13. Num. xxxi. 6. 1 Sam. xxi. 5.

(*l*) Lev. xxvii. 30. Ez. xlviii. 14. Ex. xxviii. 38. 2 Chr. xxxv. 13. Ez. xlviii. 10. xlv. 14.

holy garments and crowns ;(*m*) *holy* nation, congregation, and flock, (*n*) *holy* persons, and *holy* seed. (*o*)

The *holy flock* here mentioned, Dr. Gill justly considers as meaning “Flocks of sheep which were consecrated and set apart for holy uses, for sacrifices.” These flocks of sheep Ezekiel expressly compares to “flocks of men.” The Doctor reminds us, that in one of these *holy flocks* of sheep, there were as many as thirty thousand *lambs* given by king Josiah alone. (*p*) The sheep and lambs of these holy flocks, corresponded with the adults and infants of those “flocks, of men.” which they typified ; for the first-born of the one and the other were sanctified, or made holy, to the Lord. The Editor of Calmet’s Dictionary, therefore, justly insists, that when our Saviour said to Peter, “feed my sheep,” “feed my lambs,” he had regard to the Apostle’s duty toward the adults and infants of the church : (*q*) and these were assuredly embraced in the *holy seed* mentioned by Ezra. Our Hellenistic Jew, then, would find himself perfectly at home, when examining the New Testament regulations concerning holy children ; for they are the *holy seed*, to which he considers himself as belonging, from his infancy. He would therefore say, as we have done, that the Apostle here speaks of

4. *Seminal holiness.* Dr. Macknight and Dr. Gill

(*m*) Lev. xvi. 4. Ex. xxix. 6.

(*n*) Ex. xix. 6. Num. xvi. 3. Ez. xxxvi. 38.

(*o*) Ps. lxxxvi. 2. Ex. xiii. 2. (Comp. Luke ii. 23.) Ezr. ix. 2.

(*p*) On Ez. xxxvi. 38. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxv. 7—9.

(*q*) John xxi. 15. 16. Taylor’s Fourth Letter to a Deacon of a Baptist church, p. 28.

think that our scheme refutes itself, by understanding sanctification in different senses. They should remember, however, that this is correct with regard to many words, and with none more than the one in question. Dr. Pocock, in his notes on the *Porta Mosis* of Maimonides, says, “NOTISSIMUM EST ET QUOD SANCTUM, “ ET QUOD A SANCTITATE LONGISSIME REMOTUM EST : “ *It is very remarkable that [it signifies] both what is “ holy, and what is farthest removed from holiness.*” No Hebrew scholar will probably deny, that it signifies one who is *separated* or *consecrated to purity*, and one who is *consecrated* or *separated to prostitution* ; which latter sort of consecration the sacred writers knew to exist among the Heathen. Yet even in this diametrical opposition of meanings, you find the general idea of *separation* consistently maintained. So it is in the Pedobaptist explanation of the text. The Old Testament law passed an indiscriminate sentence of *deseccration* upon all foreign and mingled seed. It made no *distinction* between a child born of a Jew and Heathen, and a child born of two Heathens. They were both alike unholy, and, on that account, not to be circumcised. But what says the New Testament law ? It informs us that there is now a *distinction* between mingled seed, and that which is entirely foreign ; so that the former is *holy*, although the latter is not. The connexion of the believing with the unbelieving parent, so far *separates* the unbeliever from the mass of the Heathen world, that the child is not, as formerly, polluted by his Heathenism ; but is *holy*, and, on that account, has a right to the Christian circumcision, as if both parents were believers.

But now let us try Macknight and Gill by their own rule, and read the text upon their plans, with that consistency which they demand of others. In making Macknight consistent, I shall read his own paraphrase of the two first clauses of the text, and then make the rest to accord with them. It is as follows, viz. “ *For the* “ *Infidel husband is sanctified*, is fitted to remain married to the believing wife, by his affection for her; “ *and the infidel wife is sanctified, to the believing* “ *husband*, by her affection for him, *otherwise certainly by your children would be*” ‘unclean, unfitted to remain married to their parents, for want of affection, ‘ *but now are they holy*, fitted by their affection to remain in the married state.’ This is making sanctification the same thing throughout; that is, a fitness for marriage, by means of affection: whereas, in one part of the text, Macknight makes it mean the reception of food and education, which many doubtless receive without being fit for marriage.

But as Dr. Gill asserts that holiness is marriage itself, instead of a fitness for marriage, let us try how a consistent translation upon this plan will do. I shall give the two first clauses in his own words, as follows, viz. “ For “ the unbelieving husband is espoused to the wife, and “ the unbelieving wife is espoused to the husband:” ‘else were your children unmarried; but now are they ‘married.’ This makes holiness signify marriage, consistently throughout the verse: whereas the Doctor makes it mean the marriage of an adult in one place, and in another the legitimacy of an infant; which are two distinct things, since there are many legitimate infants

which are not married, and many illegitimate adults who are married.

In this procedure there is a grossness of inconsistency which deserves your particular attention. What Paul means by the holiness of infants, is the very point in dispute. We say, that it means *seminal holiness*, or a hereditary qualification for initiation into the church, a meaning which is abundantly established by scriptural usage. Dr. Gill says, that it means the civil legitimacy of infants, in which sense it is not used in the Scriptures; but he evidently wishes his reader to believe that his Jewish writers support this interpretation by innumerable examples. Would you suppose, that after his dazzling display of "Misnic, Talmudic, and Rabbinic" authorities, he has not quoted one single proof that even an infidel Jew ever understood holiness to mean legitimacy of birth? The ten cases which he has cited, and the ten thousand to which he refers, prove, without one alledged exception, that his Jewish writers considered it to mean marriage, a signification which is sometimes incompatible with the other: for if holiness mean marriage, then Jephtha, the deliverer of Israel, was holy; but if it mean legitimacy, then Jephtha was unholy. According to the Doctor's own account, therefore, his interpretation is perfectly destitute of support, from the Bible, the Talmud, or any thing else.

A few minutes ago, I mentioned that the Doctor differed from the Jewish writers in their interpretation of Job i. 5, and that, on that passage, he favoured our cause in more respects than one. He agrees with our Translators, "Job sent and *sanctified* them." The Jews read

it, "He *espoused* them to wives." On examination, we shall find that their discrepancy is very remarkable ; but not more so, than the Doctor's agreement with us. For the true meaning of ecclesiastical holiness, he refers to Ex. xix. 10. 11. 14. 15, where he shews that sanctification is an external washing of the body and garments, and abstaining from sensual pleasures, even from lawful *marriage* ! This is the very opposite of the Jewish *espousals*. When *ablution* is used as an outward sign of spiritual and ecclesiastical holiness, we call it *baptism* : yet according to Dr. Gill, the washing just now mentioned, signifies inward and outward holiness ; and, as if he were going to turn Pedobaptist outright, he produces Gen. xxxv. 2. 3, to shew that it extended to households. Here we have the Doctor proving that *sanctification* means, not *marriage*, but a *washing* to purify a man and his household. This is the way in which he should have explained Paul's declaration concerning holy children : for it is, in fact, a confirmation of the Old Testament command that they should receive that seal of initiation, which is a sign of pardon and justification, and a sign and means of sanctification ; the form of which seal, in the days of Paul, was an application of water.

It should not be passed without notice, that Dr. Gill and Dr. Macknight, and my Opponent, who for the sake of immersion, are generally anxious to prove that, *εν*, [*en*,] signifies *in*, are nevertheless willing to give up this notion in the present case, for the sake of what they think a more important point. They all consider it high treason against criticism, for us to say that EN AINON, means *at Enon*, and that EN JORDANE, means, *at the Jordan* :

yet when it will serve a turn against Pedobaptism, they can prove, as Dr. Gill has formally undertaken to do, that *en* sometimes means *to*. Notwithstanding this, I hope to prove from the writings of these men themselves, that in such places as our text, it signifies *by*.

Some time ago, I suggested a very serious doubt, whether one instance could be found in the whole Greek Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation, in which, after a marrying verb, the object was governed by the preposition *en*. To prove the improbability that such an instance can be found, I shewed that the current of Scripture is against such a construction. But can it be said that the current of Scripture is against such a construction, where verbs of sanctifying and not marrying are concerned? In such cases there is nothing more common than for the object(*r*) to be governed by the preposition *en*; and there is nothing more common than that Dr. Gill, and my Opponent, and all the Baptists, agree with us in translating it *by* instead of *to*. In order that you may perceive the exact resemblance in the construction of the text and other passages, I wish you to mark the way in which it reads; "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified, EN TE GUNAIKI, *by the wife*, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified, EN TO ANDRI, *by the husband*." To save your time we shall quote parallels, in as few words as possible. They are as follows, viz. "I will be sanctified, EN MESO, *in the midst*, Gill, *by the children of Israel*." "I will be sanctified, EN DOXE MOU, Gill, *by my glory*." Besides which, half a dozen other examples

(*r*) Or, I might rather say, the means, agent, or author.

from the Septuagint are at hand.(s) To these we add the following from the New Testament, viz. “Sanctified, EN ALETHEIA, *by the truth.*” “Sanctified, EN THEO PATRI, *by God the Father.*” “EN HO, *by which,* he was sanctified.” “Sanctified, EN PNEUMATI HAGIO, *by the Holy Spirit.*” “Sanctified, EN CHRISTO JESOU, *by Christ Jesus.*” “But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, EN TO ONOMATI, *in or by the name of the Lord Jesus,* and EN TO PNEUMATI, *by* [so my Opponent renders it,] *by the Spirit of our God.*”(t) The two last passages are in the same Epistle with our text: and all of them are so plain, that neither Macknight, Gill, nor my Opponent insinuates that they relate to marriage or legitimacy, or that *en* signifies *to*. If, then, sanctification always means sanctification, when connected as it is in our text, why should we make our text an exception? and if marriage or legitimacy can never be found so connected, why should we force them into the text? Should we not rather say with Tremellius, that the preposition used by the Apostle is a Hebraism, for PER, *by*; which Castellio and the ancient Vulgate have adopted, notwithstanding Dr. Gill’s unproved assertion, that Jerome, the author of the Vulgate, favoured his interpretation.

The truth is, the Epistle of Jerome to *Leta*, whose Christian mother had married *Albinus*, a heathen priest, expressly gives this text the *sanctifying* interpretation, even in a stronger sense than I have advocated. He makes the *sanctifying* of an unbeliever to be the *con-*

(s) Lev. xxii. 32. Ex. xxix. 43. Ez. xx. 41. xxxvi. 23. xxviii. 22. 25. xxxix. 27. xxxviii. 16.

(t) John xvii. 19. Jude i. Heb. x. 29. Rom. xv. 16. 1 Cor. i. 2. vi. 11,

verting, or *probability of converting him.*”(u) This is certainly very wide of that *marrying* or *legitimizing* interpretation which is, without evidence, attributed to him by Dr. Gill. His pretext for this may be, that in a certain instance, Jerome refers Paulinus to Tertullian’s explanation of this text. Now, although Tertullian is very vehemently claimed by my Opponent, it will appear, on examination, that Tertullian saw nothing of *marriage* or *legitimacy* in this text, but that sort of *holiness* which is enjoyed in being *born of water and of the Spirit*, or, (as he understood it,) in *baptism* and *sanctification*. “Paulinus writes to Jerome this question, ‘How are they holy, when as without the gift of the ‘grace [viz. baptism] given them afterward [after their ‘birth] and preserved, they cannot be saved?’” Among other solutions of this question, Jerome refers Paulinus to the explanation which Tertullian had given of this text, as follows, viz. “The Apostle says that when born “of a sanctified parent of either sex, children are holy; “as from seminal prerogative, so from the instituted discipline : [or, the discipline of institution :] else, says “he, were they born unclean : but yet meaning to be “understood thus : that the children of the faithful are “*designed for holiness*, and so for salvation ; that by a “pledge of such hope he might plead for those marriages which he would have to be continued. Otherwise, [or, as for any other meaning] he knew well “enough what our Lord had determined, Except one “be born of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter

(u) Wall’s History, Part. 1. Chap. 19. Sect. 19.

“into the kingdom of God.”^(v) From such evidence as this, Dr. Wall very honestly concludes “that Tertullian “differs from them [that is, from Augustine and Pelagius in their comments on this text,] only in this, that “he [Tertullian] expounds the holiness that such children have by the prerogative of their birth, by these “words, *SANCTITATI DESIGNATI, designed for holiness*, because he reckons and proves from Scripture, “that they cannot be actually holy, till they are actually “baptized; and that Jerome and Paulinus speak to the “same effect.”^(w)

Tertullian calls *baptism*, by which the infants of believers are made *holy*, *INSTITUTIONIS DISCIPLINA, the discipline of institution*; that is, an ordinance by which they are made *disciples*, according to Christ’s *appointment*. Thus Augustine considers it in the following passage, viz. “But that is to be held without any doubt, “that whatever *that holiness*, *ILLA SANCTIFICATIO*, “may be, it is not available to the making of them Christians, or to the pardon of sins, unless they be made *believers*, *FIDELES*, [according to him, infants can be “made Christians and believers] *CHRISTIANA ET ECCLESIASTICA INSTITUTIONE ET SACRAMENTIS, by the “Christian and ecclesiastical institution and sacraments*.” That he here means the sacrament of baptism, which is the initiatory institution of the Christian church, is evident from the words immediately following

(v) “Hinc enim et Apostolus ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait; tam ex seminis prerogativa quam ex institutionis disciplina,” &c. See Wall’s History, Part 1. Chap. 4. Sect. 6. Chap. 19. Sect. 19.

(w) Wall’s Hist. Part. 1. Chap. 11. Sect. 11.

those which have just been quoted, viz. “ For neither
 “ are unbelieving husbands or wives, how *holy* and just
 “ partners soever they have, cleansed from the iniquity
 “ which keeps them from the kingdom of God, and
 “ brings them to damnation ; nor are infants, of how *holy*
 “ and just parents soever they come, pardoned the guilt
 “ of original sin, unless they [that is, the one and the
 “ other,] be *baptized* in Christ.(x) The same Father,
 in explaining this text in relation to the Apostolic
 churches, says, “ For there were then PARVULI
 “ CHRISTIANI, *Christian infants*, that were *sanctified*,
 “ some by the authority of one of their parents, some by
 “ the consent of both.”(y) Here he speaks of baptized
 infants as those which were *sanctified* by parental author-
 ity. In proof that he undoubtedly meant baptismal
 sanctification, I would read another passage reported by
 Dr. Wall ; according to whom, “ St. Austin, in his
 “ questions on Leviticus, has this inquiry ; How it is
 “ meant that Moses should *sanctify* the high priest,
 “ Lev. xxi. 8. when God says, verse 15, ‘ I the Lord
 “ do sanctify him ?’ In answer to which he distinguish-
 “ es between the visible sanctification and the invisible :
 “ and after some discourse that the invisible is the chief,
 “ but yet that the other is not to be neglected, says,
 “ ‘ Hence Cornelius and they that were with him, when
 “ ‘ they appeared to be already *sanctified* invisibly by
 “ ‘ the Holy Ghost coming on them, were, for all that,
 “ ‘ *baptized* : nor was the *visible sanctification* counted
 “ ‘ needless because the invisible was before.’ ”(z)

(x) Wall’s History, Part 1. Chap. 19. Sect. 19.

(y) Wall’s History, Part 1. Chap. 15. Sect. 2.

(z) Wall’s History, Part 1. Chap. 11. Sect. 19.

That Chrysostom also had substantially the same views, will appear from his comment on 1 Cor. i. 2. where he says, that *sanctification* means “the laver, [viz. of baptism,] the cleansing.”(a) In accordance with this, Bingham informs us that “Theodoret and others explain the word, *ἁγιοι*, *saints*, or *sanctified ones*, to be such as were vouchsafed the honour and privilege of baptism.”(b) Wall cites Ainsworth, Lightfoot, Hammond, &c. as shewing most fully and clearly that this was the understanding of the Jews, in relation to the ceremonial *sanctifications* of their law, which indeed Paul himself calls *diverse baptisms*.(c) These authorities go to shew that the Ecclesiastical Fathers expounded 1 Cor. vii. 14. of infants’ holiness in our sense: yet, as Dr. Fishback and my Opponent pretended, that, Calvin and Beza had originated our doctrine, that circumcision and baptism were the same seal; so Mr. Tombes, in his Debate with Mr. Baxter asserts, that we “cannot find any one author that expoundeth 1 Cor. vii. 14. of infants holiness in” Mr. Baxter’s “sense, before Luther and Zuinglius!!”(d) These assertions are equally wise, and they both resemble that of the Roman Catholic priest, who said, that the Reformers originated the Greek Testament.

But in Mr. Baxter’s Report of his Debate with Mr. Tombes, he reminds him of a singular concession which he made in relation to this text. Says he to Mr. Tombes, the Baptist champion, “You yielded that the word *sanc-*

(a) Wall’s Hist. Part. 1. Chap. 11. Sect. 19.

(b) Bingham’s Antiquities, Book 1. Chap. 1. p. 3. quoted in Wall’s Defence against Gale, p. 384.

(c) Hebr. ix. 10. Wall’s Hist. Part 1. Chap. 11. Sect. 19.

(d) Baxter’s Report of the Debate, p. 208.

“ *tify*, and *holy*, is taken in my sense near six hundred
 “ times in scripture, and no where else once in your
 “ sense ; and yet pleaded, that here it must be taken in
 “ yours, and not in mine, without showing any ground
 “ for a necessity of it !” (e) Strange as this may seem,
 the Editor of Calmet’s Dictionary has furnished us with
 a concession no less remarkable on the same text, from
 one of the most learned and zealous Baptist controver-
 sialists now living. In the close of the preface of a work
 called “The Baptists Self-convicted,” the Editor speaks
 as follows : viz. “Mr. Anderson [the learned Baptist,]
 “ abandons the *brethren* (servants) of Lydia ; he ex-
 “ pressly renounces the idea of *legitimacy* as denoted by
 “ the term *holy* in reference to children ; and I under-
 “ stand that nobody now thinks of arguing on the ‘ much
 “ water’ of Enon ! These are hopeful symptoms.” In the
 same Author’s second series of “ Facts and Evidences
 “ on the subject of Baptism.” (f) he quotes Mr. Ander-
 son’s words. They are as follows, viz. “ To interpret
 “ *holy* (*αγια*) as signifying *legitimate*, is not authorized
 “ by any example, from sacred or profane writers !!”
 Some would think this a surrender ; but it is intended
 only as a capitulation : for while this zealous Anabaptist
 was relinquishing one untenable position, he was stipu-
 lating for another, which he vainly thought impregnable.
 He was just exchanging an old exposed perversion of the
 text, for a novel perversion which he thought more plau-
 sible. He fled from Gill’s *civil holiness*, to take shelter
 under Macknight’s *domestic holiness*. He could no

(e) Baxter’s Report of the Debate, p. 208.

(f) p. 64.

longer believe that Paul's *infant holiness* signified *legitimacy*, for the very good reason, that this meaning "is not authorised by any example, from sacred or profane writers." From this we should expect at least a few collations of the word in his newly discovered meaning. But what examples has he given us, in which either Sacred or Profane writers have spoken of the holiness of infants, to mean their clothing and lodging, their boarding and schooling, as being "the objects" of parental affection and care?" It has been shewn that Macknight is not only without proof, but in opposition to proof; and as for Anderson, he comes off with saying that "If this interpretation, which is more *probable* than any other that has been proposed, be admitted, the text will not afford the least countenance to the baptism of babes." To this I would reply, that if many other interpretations of that cold-blooded traitor be admitted, the respective texts will not afford the least countenance to the Gospel plan of salvation. But if this novel fancy of Macknight's be "more *probable* than any other that has been proposed," and if it be, at the same time, such decisive evidence of Baptist principles, how comes it that it "contradicts all Baptist writers for more than a century past? How comes it that this obvious meaning never occurred to "Drs. Gill, Stennett, Ryland, Mr. Booth, &c. &c.?" all of whom "assert that the term *holy* in this passage signifies *legitimate*?" And how comes it that neither the interpretation of these *legitimates*, nor the "more *probable*" one of Macknight and his *illegitimates*, was adopted by the ancient Fathers? but that the Pedobaptist interpretation was followed by them, as has been

shewn from the testimony of Paulinus and Jerome, Chrysostom and Augustine, and even my Opponent's Baptist brother Tertullian, and his heretical brother Pelagius? Mr. Tombes can afford us a clue to this mystery, in his concession to Mr. Baxter, that the word *sanctify*, and *holy*, is taken in the Pedobaptist sense near six hundred times, and no where else once in the Baptist sense. The truth is, we follow broad scriptural usage, both in translating and expounding this passage: whereas, both in translating and expounding, the Baptists, not only oppose the scriptures and the Fathers, but contradict themselves and one another, and substitute their own arbitrary inventions and incongruous assertions for fair criticism and solid exegesis.

We have now given that candid hearing which was promised, to the respective claims of *spiritual*, *domestic*, *civil*, and *seminal holiness*, in the interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 14. after which it appears plain, that the *seminal*, or, if you choose, the *ecclesiastical holiness* of infants, is intended by the Apostle, when he says, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean, but now are they *holy*:" or "designed for holiness;" as the Baptist Father Tertullian paraphrases it; meaning that by "*seminal prerogative*," as well as "the discipline of institution," the infants of pious parents are designed for *baptism*; an ordinance which Augustine, in conformity with Jewish and Christian usage, inspired and uninspired, expressly calls "*the visible sanctification*." Instead, therefore, of a repeal, we here have a New Testament confirmation

of the command for administering to infants the initiatory seal of the church.

POINT III.

As the Scriptures recognize the discipleship of infants, infants must be contemplated in our Lord's command to his Apostles, to disciple all nations by baptism.

“Go ye therefore, and *teach* (*disciple*) all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you : and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.”(*g*)

The Baptists have two different and contradictory schemes, for resisting the force of this text. One is, to make the verb MATHETEUEIN signify *to teach* those who are capable of believing, and thus to *exclude* infants who do not believe. The other plan is, to admit and even to urge that MATHETEUEIN signifies to *disciple* or *make disciples*, but that this *discipleing* is equivalent to *conversion*, which conversion, according to them, the text makes a prerequisite to baptism ; and thus they exclude infants who give no evidence of conversion.

The first of these courses is pursued by Mr. Gale. In advocating it, Dr. Wall convicts him of as gross stupidity, or dishonesty, or both, as can perhaps be found any where else. But admitting, as Dr. Wall certainly proves, that Mr. Gale was incapable of discussing the Original, still our Translation has the appearance of

favouring his cause; for it gives the verb his renderin,
 “*teach* all nations.” To this I would reply that the
 same Translators have left us the other rendering also.
 Their margin reads, “or *make disciples* or *Christians*
 “ of all nations.” Dr. Wall, moreover, argues that the
 reason of their putting the word *teach* into the text
 “ was, that in the time of making the old translations,
 “ there were no Antipedobaptists (and when the En-
 “ glish Translation was made, none in England,) who
 “ should thence take occasion for their error, viz. to
 “ conclude that infants, though a part of the nation,
 “ must not be baptized, as not being yet taught. All
 “ people then understood it thus: That the Apostles,
 “ going into the Heathen nations, must first teach and
 “ convert the adult persons and baptize them; and then
 “ at their request, baptize their children, into the same
 “ covenant; and while all took it so, there was no hurt
 “ in letting the word *teach* stand.”(h) It is very cor-
 rectly granted by Dr. Wall, “ that where the circum-
 “ stances of the passage and of the persons spoken of
 “ do shew it to be meant of adult persons now in the
 “ state of learning, there *to make disciples* does import
 “ *teaching* of them; and in such places it does often
 “ best fit the construction of the sentence to express it
 “ *teach*; because, as I said before, in most places where
 “ the word occurs, the discipleing is by present teach-
 “ ing :”(i) But, on the other hand, the Dr. observes that
 “ This very thing of choosing a new word on pur-
 “ pose for this sacrament, (viz. *discipleing* in general)

(h) Wall's Defence against Gale, p. 172.

(i) Wall's Defence, p. 176.

“ is, of itself, a proof that it is not to be taken in the same limited sense as the word *teaching*; for if it had been to express *teaching*, there were plenty of common and known words in use for that.”(j) And let it be observed that one of these common and known words for *teaching* is used by our Saviour in the same sentence, in such a manner as to shew that it was not there to be considered as perfectly synonymous with *matheteuein*.

The second course is pursued by Dr. Gill, who would have discipleship to mean conversion, and to be so essentially prerequisite to baptism as to exclude infants. On John iv. 1. he says, “ The method Christ took was, he first made men disciples, and then baptized them; and the same he directed his Apostles to, saying, ‘ go and *teach*, or *disciple* all nations, baptizing them ‘ &c.’ ” My Opponent’s New Testament goes so far as to translate it “ *Convert* all the nations, immersing them!” On the present occasion he has treated this text as follows, viz. “ I will appeal directly to the law of Christ concerning this ordinance of his, which I find in the commission to baptize.” “ The law of Christian baptism, as expressed in the commission, is, ‘ Baptize the disciples, or the believers of the gospel. It thus reads, ‘ Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, ‘ baptizing them in the name’ &c. Now MATHETEU-SATE, the verb here rendered *teach*, is conceded by all intelligent Paido-baptists to signify, *make disciples*, or *disciple*. This is unquestionably the proper ren-

“ dering of the term MATHETEUSATE. The verb MA-
 “ THETEUO, when governing an accusative, Parkhurst,
 “ the Paido-baptist lexicographer says, signifies ‘ to
 “ ‘ *make a disciple.*’ p. 412. It is not the nations in-
 “ discriminately, that were commanded to be baptized;
 “ for TA ETHNE, *the nations*, being *neuter*, is not the
 “ antecedent to AUTOUS, [*them,*] which is masculine,
 “ and which is the accusative governed by MATHETEU-
 “ SATE. Its antecedent is MATHETAS in the verb MA-
 “ THETEUSATE. Again the phrase, ‘ *teaching them to*
 “ ‘ *observe all things which I have commanded you,*’
 “ respects the disciples *exclusively*. For Christ did
 “ never command nations indiscriminately to observe his
 “ ordinances, but only his disciples. He commanded
 “ all nations to repent and believe the gospel, and then,
 “ as his disciples, he commanded them to keep his com-
 “ mandments. Hence the word rendered *teach* in the
 “ 20th verse of Matt. xxviii. is not the same as the
 “ word rendered *teach* in the 19th verse. It is DIDAS-
 “ KONTES, a word importing the office of a preceptor to
 “ those who had been put under his tuition. It is ex-
 “ pressive of that tuition which teachers owe to their
 “ disciples or pupils. Two things or two classes of
 “ duties were enjoined on the Apostles in this commis-
 “ sion. The first was the work of *discipleing* or *ma-*
 “ *king disciples*. The second was the education of those
 “ disciples collected into churches or schools. Now
 “ inasmuch as the Apostles were authorized by the law
 “ of Christ to baptize disciples, this law, in fact, amounts
 “ to a *prohibition* of the baptism of those who are not
 “ disciples. This I cannot now illustrate better than

“ by a reference to the Appendix of Debate with Mr.
 “ Walker, to which Mr. M‘Calla so often refers. p. 209.
 “ ‘ A limited commission implies a prohibition of such
 “ things as are not contained in it, and positive laws
 “ imply their negative.’ The commission under which
 “ the Apostles acted was limited, as every Christian will
 “ confess. The duties of those who act under it are
 “ pointed out: and indeed every creature must act un-
 “ der a limited commission, for the very term itself im-
 “ ports something committed from a superior, or from
 “ the supreme.”(k)

In this argument my Baptist Opponent has certainly
 shewn, that all that Mr. Gale has written on the same
 text, is lost labour. In opposition to him, he proves that
 the Apostles were commanded to “ *disciple* all nations,
baptizing them.” Yet he tries to criticise us out of the
 opinion, that the apostles *discipled* them in *baptizing*
 them. That adults gave evidence of knowledge and con-
 version before baptism, I would not only admit, but in-
 sist upon. That they and their infants were formally
 discipled in baptism, I hope to shew. The only obstruc-
 tion presented by my Opponent’s argument, is his en-
 deavour to shew, that if the apostles *baptized disciples*,
 they must have been *disciples* before they were *baptized*,
 and, of course, could not be made *disciples* in *baptism*.
 When I hear such a plea from a man of such pretensions,
 I feel considerably inclined to hand him over to that old
 lady, by whose common sense, he tells us, he was once
 overpowered, notwithstanding all his philosophy and

(k) Spurious Debate with me, pp. 58, 113, 114.

divinity.(l) Not long ago I observed a housewife sending a messenger with thread to a seamstress. Her commission ran thus; “Remember and tell her that this black thread is to *sew the seams*.” My Opponent, on hearing this commission, would have said, ‘Madam, if she is to *sew the seams*, they must be *seams* before her *sewing* them, and therefore her *sewing* cannot make them *seams*.’ If, on receiving this answer, she were to report the thing to a recruiting officer in the neighbourhood, he would probably give a commission to his sergeant in the following words; “Go and *enlist* that Philosopher, *giving him the bounty*.” On this commission my Opponent could meet the officer sword in hand, and prove that *giving the bounty* does not *make a soldier*; although he would probably be very reluctant to try the experiment of receiving the bounty. The following argument on this subject will quadrate with the one which he has given, to prove that baptizing does not make disciples. It is as follows, viz. “The verb *enlist*, when governing an accusative, it is conceded by all military men, signifies *to make a soldier*. It is not *philosophers* indiscriminately that are commanded, in this commission, to be *enlisted*. *Philosopher* is not the antecedent to *him*; its antecedent is *soldier*, in the verb *enlist*. For our Constitution did never command *philosophers* indiscriminately to observe the rules and articles of war, but only United States’ *soldiers*. It commands all *citizens* to obey the laws, and then as *soldiers*, it commands them to submit to military regulations. As, therefore, *the bounty* was to be *given* to none but *soldiers*, they

(l) Spurious Debate with me, Preface, p. x.

must have been *soldiers* before the bounty was given. Wherefore, *giving the bounty*, does not make a soldier; and ‘ALL MY PHILOSOPHY AND DIVINITY,’ my *verbs* and *accusatives*, my *antecedents* and *relatives*, would be perfectly safe in receiving the bounty; although at the same time I should not like to try it.”

My Baptist Opponent thinks it of great importance to prove that our Saviour’s commission does not authorize the baptizing of *the nations* but *the disciples*. But when this point is gained, how does it help his cause? If *baptizing disciples* proves that they must have been *disciples* before they were *baptized*; then “*Perverting the deceitful balances*,” proves, that they were *deceitful* before they were *perverted*—“*Grind meal*,” means that it was *meal* before it was *ground*—and “*Stripped the naked of their clothing*,” means that they were *naked* before Job *stripped* them; (*m*) which things are absurd. If, therefore, *stripping the naked* makes him *naked*; if *giving the bounty to a soldier* makes him *a soldier*; if *falsifying deceitful balances* makes them *deceitful balances*; if *sewing a seam* makes it *a seam*; and if *grinding meal* makes it *meal*, then why may not *baptizing disciples* make them *disciples*?

It is certainly my Opponent’s aim to prove that *discipleing* does not, in any case, mean mere *initiation*, of which an infant may be the subject; but that it means that conversion, of which none but an educated or enlightened adult can be the subject. It is for this reason that, instead of “*disciple all nations*,” his New Testa-

(*m*) Isa. xlvii. 2. Job, xxii. 6. Am. viii. 5., on which last see Hebr. and Engl. Margin and Pool’s Annotations on Job, xxii. 6.

ment reads “*Convert* all the nations.” But let us see how this will tally with his argument. There he informs us that, DIDASKONTES, *teaching*, as well as MATHETES, *disciple*, “respects the disciples exclusively:” that is, teaching respects converted persons exclusively; since *disciple* and *convert* are, in his view, convertible terms. This he expresses more fully as follows, viz. “Two things, or two classes of duties, were enjoined on “the Apostles in this commission. The first was the “work of *discipling* or *making disciples*. The second “was the education of those disciples collected into “churches or schools.” That is, the Apostles were commanded, first to *disciple* or *convert* adults, and then to educate or instruct them!! Conversion first, instruction last!! This is bad enough; but I am afraid that it leads to worse. As my Opponent is for abolishing the whole order of the gospel ministry, he would *teach* the people that they should have neither instructors nor instruction. But as he is opposed to the operations of the Spirit of God in regeneration, he is equally opposed to their conversion: so that, in reality, he is for no conversion, no instruction. Now we are for both the one and the other, and in their proper order. We believe that as far as adults are contemplated in our Saviour’s commission, they are to be first instructed. This, by the immediate agency of the Divine Spirit, becomes an instrument of their conversion. Then, when there is evidence of their conversion, they are baptized. It was, as Dr. Wall intimates, with a view to this process, in the case of adults, that our English Translators put into the text the word *teach* instead of *disciple*. But their mar-

ginal reading, which my Opponent has shewn to be strictly conformable to the Greek, evidently leaves room for another order of things in the case of infants. In relation to them, my Opponent's exposition of the text, loses a portion of its absurdity, and looks like solid, scriptural reality. Infants, and infants only, should be first disciplined, then instructed. In contemplation of infants, it may be truly said, as my Opponent has most inconsistently and improperly said concerning adults; that "Two classes of duties were enjoined on the apostles in this commission: the first was the work of *discipleing* or *making disciples*; the second was the education of those *disciples* collected into churches or schools." This is only saying that infants should first be *disciplined* by *baptism*, and then brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

With this view of the subject, which my Opponent's own comment has made necessary, we discover that this text affords the same authority for infant baptism, which another passage quoted by him, furnishes for female communion. The passage is, that Christ "gave it [the bread] to his *disciples*, and said, Take, eat."⁽ⁿ⁾ He then produces another passage to shew that "there was a certain *disciple* there named Tabitha."^(o) She, therefore, being a *disciple* capable of discerning the Lord's body, must have been admitted to communion. Wherefore, all other female disciples of the same description should be admitted to the same privilege. In a similar way, we shew that the apostles were commissioned to "*disciple*

(n) Matt. xxvi. 26. Spur. Debate with Mr. Walker, p. 69.

(o) Acts ix. 36.

all nations, *baptizing* them." We then shew that infants were recognized as *disciples*; and conclude, that the apostles must have made them so by *baptizing* them, as they were made disciples among the Jews by circumcision.

In reference to this severe discipline, which was imposed upon Jewish professors and their infants, Peter says, "Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the *disciples*, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" Dr. Gill says, that these *disciples* are "Gentile believers;" thus probably meaning to frown upon infant *discipleship*, because infants cannot *believe*. He admits, however, that this yoke embraces circumcision, though he says, that "by it here is meant not circumcision *only* and *barely*." Now I would ask, What sort of *disciples* they were, on whose neck this yoke was first imposed? They were chiefly Jewish infants. I would again ask, What sort of *disciples* were they, on whose necks these Judaizing teachers wished to impose this grievous yoke when Peter spoke? Were they "Gentile believers" only? No, it was Gentile and Jewish believers and their infants; which would have still thrown the burthen of circumcision chiefly upon the infants, because a great proportion of the adults had been already circumcised. This then, shews, that the apostles understood their commission as we do; and, that in *discipling* all nations, they *discipled* believers and their seed, "*baptizing* them."

That Jews and Christians thus understood the Old and New Testaments, cannot be reasonably disputed. Out of Dr. Wall's many instances of Jewish usage, I will

report only one, from Maimonides, as follows, viz. “ An Israelite that takes a little Heathen child, or that finds an Heathen infant, and baptizes him for a *Proselyte* : behold, he is a *Proselyte*.”^(p) Even Dr. Gill tells us, that “ Jarchi interprets these *children* [mentioned in “ Prov. xxxi. 28.] of *disciples*.” The ancient Christian usage may be gathered from Tertullian, the great boast of the Baptists. His views of infant discipleship may be seen in a passage quoted already under the last point. He there tells us, that “ The Apostle says, [in 1 Cor. “ vii. 14.] that children born of a *holy* parent of either sex, are themselves *holy*, [that is fit for baptism,] as well from seminal prerogative, as from the *discipline* of institution [that is, Christ’s institution for making “ *disciples*.]”^(r) That Tertullian really used this expression to signify the ordinance of baptism, by which Christ requires us to initiate adult and infant *disciples* into the visible church, will appear by another passage, from the same author, which my Opponent introduces against Mr. Walker, in the following pompous manner, viz. “ But I have another testimony of Tertullian to read, which I hope will be heard with all the impartiality you can command. It accounts for more than “ the origin of infant baptism. It is doubtless one of “ the best authenticated testimonies of antiquity.” He then proceeds to give Tertullian’s account of certain unscriptural customs, by which he professed to initiate and build up *disciples*, and which, for that reason, this

^(p) Wall’s Hist. Introduction, Sect. 4.

^(r) Wall’s Hist. Part 1. Chap. 4. Sect. 6. The Doctor has mistaken the meaning of the word discipline here, as the Baptists do in other places.

Father calls *disciplines*, but which my Opponent's translation calls *practices*, as follows, viz. "If you demand
 " a law for these *practices*, taken from the scriptures,
 " we cannot find one there." He should have translated it in something like the following manner, viz. "If,
 " for these *disciplines*, and others of the same sort, you
 " require scriptural authority, you can find none."^(s)
 Among these unauthorized *disciplines*, we find the sign of the cross, and the use of milk and honey, and trine immersion in baptism. Doubtless, Mr. Walker, against whom this passage was so vauntingly produced, will agree with Tertullian, that the sign of the cross and the baptismal use of milk and honey, are unauthorized in scripture, and that trine immersion or any other immersion, is unauthorized there: but he will also agree with the same Father in believing that Christian baptism is Christ's instituted *discipline*, by which *discipleship* is conferred upon those who have a *seminal prerogative* derived from a *holy* parent of either sex. These infant *disciples* are thus initiated into the visible church and have been considered as visible Christians, ever since the day that "The *disciples* were called
 " *Christians* first in Antioch." Some infants must have been thus *discipled*, immediately after this change of denomination, because, in old age they were the personal acquaintances of Justin Martyr, who speaks of them in the following language, viz. "Several persons among
 " us, of sixty and seventy years old, of both sexes, who

(s) "Harum et aliarum ejusmodi *disciplinarum* si legem expostulas scripturarum, nullam invenies." This is quoted in a note in Dr. J. P. Campbell's Review of Robinson, p. 133.

“ were *discipled* to Christ in their childhood, do continue “ uncorrupted.” They were *discipled to Christ*; an expression which shews that they were *discipled*, not by *instruction* or *conversion* or by an unauthorized practice, as my Opponent would have it, but by *baptism*, the *instituted discipline* of Tertullian, who has declared *baptism* to be a *discipline*, even in that passage which my Opponent praises as “ one of the best authenticated testimonies of antiquity,” in relation to “ the origin of infant baptism.” It ought not to be omitted that when Justin M  rt  r speaks of their being *discipled* in their *childhood*, he uses the word *p  don*, the one which enters into the composition of *P  dobaptism*; and the word which he uses for *discipled*, is *ematheteuthesan*, (t) the very word used by our Saviour in commanding his apostles to “ *disciple* all nations, *baptizing* them.” Is there then any room to doubt the correctness of my third point, that “ As the scriptures recognize the *discipleship* of infants, infants must be contemplated in “ our Lord’s command to his apostles to *disciple* all nations by baptism ?”

You cannot now wonder, if I consider it proved, according to the tenor of my fifth proposition, that after the authoritative command recorded in the Old Testament, “ The administration of this seal to infants has never since been prohibited by divine authority; that is, this command of God, originally given in the Old Tes-

(t)    ex p  don : μαθητευθεσαν τω χριστ  .

tament, is not repealed in the New Testament, but rather confirmed." According to promise, this has been shewn from what is said in the new Testament, concerning " the *membership* of infants, the *holiness* of infants, and the *discipleship* of infants."

My evidence in favour of a divine command for infant baptism has occupied more time than is usually spent on this subject. Respect to the good cause of truth, and to the understandings of my audience, required that I should pay a becoming attention to my Opponent's numerous contradictions and objections. None of these were advanced against my fourth proposition ; and therefore, that proposition, though occupying one-fifth of the ground of my argument, was passed over in a few words. But when the other propositions were contradicted, it became necessary not only to refute those objections, but to develope an unusual portion of the ample stores of authority, which the scriptures contain in support of those propositions. These copious proofs are an evidence, not of the difficulty, but of the facility with which infant baptism is established. They shew, not the doubtfulness, but the certainty of the divine will. Neither is this certainty in the least affected, by the fact that we arrive at the conclusion by a circuitous route ; since the very same complication has been shewn to attend the argument for female communion and many other things equally plain. Let any one take the propositions, and duly consider them, distinctly, and in their mutual relation, and ponder well the evidence by which they

are supported, and the conclusion to which they tend, and he will not wonder that the great body of Christ's people, from the beginning, have been Pedobaptists. To them the scriptures shew plainly, that, 1. Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God. 2. The Christian Church is a branch of the Abrahamic Church : or, in other words, the Jewish Society before Christ, and the Christian Society after Christ, are one and the same Church, in different dispensations. 3. Jewish Circumcision before Christ, and Christian Baptism after Christ, are one and the same seal, in *substance*, though in different *forms*. 4. The administration of this seal to infants was once enjoined by divine authority ; that is, God once commanded it. 5. The administration of this seal to infants has never since been prohibited by divine authority ; that is, this command of God, originally given in the Old Testament, is not repealed in the New Testament, but rather confirmed. Therefore, there is now in force, an unrepealed divine command, for administering to believers and their infants, the initiatory seal of the Church, which, under the Christian dispensation, is baptism. If the premises be true, the conclusion is inevitable : but the premises have been proved to be true ; therefore the conclusion stands ; and my first argument, for infant baptism, drawn from a divine command, is valid, according to the infallible word of God.

ARGUMENT II.

APOSTOLICAL PRACTICE. HOUSEHOLD BAPTISM.

According to custom, my Opponent represents the argument drawn from household baptism as destitute of probability; and, if I remember rightly, there are some Pedobaptists who speak of it, as if it amounted to little or nothing more than *probable* evidence. I would ask such persons, upon what sort of authority do they receive females to communion? Is it *probable* or *certain*? They will say, with my Opponent, that the evidence is indubitable, because females are disciples, and for disciples it was instituted. Yet our Saviour gave no express command to administer it to a female; there was no female among the disciples to whom he administered it; and there is no *express* record of Apostolical practice, in favour of female communion. If, without these, the evidence is certain, how much more so, if, like infant baptism, it could be supported by divine command and apostolical practice. This practice of the apostles would have been taken as *positive* evidence, fully made out, if the Acts of the Apostles had recorded several instances in which *heads of families* communed; because *heads of families* would embrace *females*. Now we have evidence, in the Acts of the Apostles, that they baptized *households*, and we hope to shew that *households* embrace *infants*; and the fact that some *households* are without infants, is of no more avail in the one case, than the fact that some families have no female head, will avail in the other. In proving that infants are included in the baptized households of the New Testament, I shall, of course, make liberal use of Taylor's "Facts and Evidences," much of which Dr. Rice, of Virginia, has copied, with valuable additional matter of his own.

But the strength of our argument cannot be duly appreciated, without giving some attention to that of my Opponent. He speaks as follows, viz.*

* The reader will notice, that from p. 223 to note (u) on p. 331, is Mr. Campbell's argument.

“Mr. M‘Calla has adopted the criticism of Rice and Taylor on the words *oikos* and *oikia*, and is to give us positive evidence of infant baptism from the import of these words, Mr. Rallston, who has written what he calls a ‘Brief Review’ of the Debate at Mount Pleasant, has adopted the same, and mightily boasts of the importance of the criticism. Mr. M‘Calla tells us it is founded on the decisions of Aristotle and Plato, and lays the greatest stress upon it. Now we have not read Rice’s Pamphleteer, but we have read some [all] of the writings of Aristotle and Plato in the original, and we have read Dr. Samuel Rallston’s ‘Condensed View’ of the criticism, and we boldly pronounce that it is a ‘*refuge of lies*.’ And we will go a little farther yet, and affirm, that not only is the criticism erroneous, but that assertions are made in the ‘Condensed View’ referred to, that are downright falsehoods. Mark it well, my friends, we have said *falsehoods*. Whether intentional or not, is not my duty to say. But if I do not prove to the satisfaction of every one who understands English, and especially to any one who knows only the Greek alphabet, all that I have now affirmed concerning this criticism and those assertions, I will say that I know neither English nor Greek. But this we will not attempt until Mr. M‘Calla gives us the whole it. In the mean time, we will request your attention to the households baptized, or ‘family baptisms,’ as some call them, mentioned in the New Testament. Of these there are but four. Of three of these we have *positive* proof that all baptized were professed disciples, capable of *hearing*, *believing* and *obeying* the word. The only family that admits of the least hesitation with respect to the members of it, is that of Lydia: and if there had not been another family baptized in the narrative than this one, or if there had been the same want of particularity in describing, incidentally or explicitly, the baptism of the others, it would be utterly impossible for any man living to furnish a positive evidence of infant baptism from Scripture testimony. We have, indeed, already shewn, that the apostles

baptized none but professed disciples, by facts and arguments that Mr. M'Calla dared not to impugn; and therefore might be excused from noticing this ten thousand times refuted notion of infants having been baptized in these four families. But that the fullest satisfaction may be afforded to all interested, we will again condescend to visit the families alluded to. With respect to Lydia's family, of the circumstances of which there is the least said, and therefore the more room for conjecture, as we see in all the references to it by the Paido-baptists, we will just mention, that six things must be proved, before it can be proved from it, that we have positive evidence of apostolic practice of infant baptism. 1. That Lydia ever had a husband. 2. That she had a husband lately. 3. That she ever had children. 4. That she had brought her children with her from Thyatira to Philippi, a journey of 200 miles, mostly by sea. 5. That her children were then infants, and 6. That they were actually baptized. All this must be done before Mr. M'Calla's positive can be adduced. *Now let me ask, can Mr. M'Calla prove ANY ONE of these circumstances?* I positively answer, *No, not one.* Where, then, is his positive evidence to be obtained from Lydia's house? Indeed there is not *probable* evidence, much less *positive* evidence, of infant baptism in this family." "But just let us look at the circumstances of Lydia's family, and consider what is most probable in the case. 1. She shews herself to be the sole proprietor of her house, and precludes the idea of having a husband, in these words, Acts xvi. 15. 'Come into my house, and tarry with me.' 2. That she was an unmarried woman is probable from her manner of giving the invitation, which indeed is the most singular invitation on record, 'If ye have judged me *faithful* to the Lord, come into my house.' It is equivalent to saying, if you have formed a good opinion of my being under subjection to Christ, you will not impeach my modesty, or suppose me actuated by any other motive

than the love of my Master, in inviting you to sojourn with a woman. 3. That she was an unmarried woman at this time, is further evident from her manner of life. She was a travelling merchant, and far from her own city. 4. It is also probable that the brethren mentioned in 4th verse, were members of her family, servants or relatives in her employ." "Thus, from a fair and full consideration of all the circumstances of Lydia's house, there is not the least probability that there was an infant in it. But if even it had been probable that infants belonged to Lydia's house, we are absolutely certified from other portions of the divine testimony, that they were not baptized." "The time has fully come when it becomes my duty, from a promise already given you, my friends, to prove that this new discovery made on purpose to aid the falling cause of infant baptism, is a refuge of lies. I have said that it is a refuge of lies. Many seek shelter under such refuges without knowing them to be such. Perhaps this was the case with Mr. Rallston and my Opponent. Be this as it may, we are sure it is a refuge of lies, and that the alledged difference between *oikos* and *oikia* is not only an erroneous criticism, but that statements made concerning these terms are absolutely false. Whether intentional or not, lies not in my way to judge or to express. We are only concerned in what is said, on the present occasion, and not in the motive or design of the speaker or writer. I then positively assert that in the bible, there is no more difference betwixt the use and application of the words *oikos* and *oikia* than there is between the words *brothers* and *brethren*. I suppose you all know that the difference betwixt the words *brothers* and *brethren* is only in the orthography or spelling of the words, and that there is no difference in the sense. Now for the proof. Paul says, 1 Cor. i. 16, I baptized the *oikos* of Stephanas, and in the same Epistle, addressed to the same church, in speaking of the same family, Chap. xvi. 15, he calls this family the *oikia* of Stephanas. 'Ye

know,' says he, '*the household* (ΤΕΝ ΟΙΚΙΑΝ) of Stephanas that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.' Here the same family, by the same writer, is called, in the same letter, both *oikos* and *oikia*. Any person that knows the Greek alphabet can see that this is as I have said. Where now is the truth of Mr. Rallston's declaration, p. 19. 'Hence,' says he, when we read of Cornelius and his *house*, of Lydia and her *house*, of the Jailer and his *house*, and of Stephanas and his *house*, in all of which, *oikos* and not *oikia* is used. He says, not *oikia* is used, but here I have shewn that it is! This proves the assertion false. And that you may see that it is erroneous, we have only to observe that Mr. Rallston and Mr. Rice and Mr. M'Calla say, that *oikia* denotes servants, as the servants of Cesar's *household*, (ΟΙΚΙΑΣ) as Mr. Rallston quotes it; and then so to translate it whenever it occurs. Thus said Paul, Chap. i. I baptized the *infants*, (ΟΙΚΟΣ) of Stephanas, and Chap. xvi. Ye know the *servants*, (ΟΙΚΙΑ) of Stephanas that they were the first fruits, &c. and thus make the apostle give a representation of Stephanas as a father, in one place, as a slaveholder or master in another; having servants that were not servants, but freemen, addicting themselves to the service of the saints, when they were their master's property, and having no time at their own disposal. What contradictions and inconsistencies appear in a bold advocate of this human tradition! But that *oikos* and *oikia* are applied in the bible to the self-same family, and to the self-same house, will appear from a few references. I would only premise one remark, viz. that the difference betwixt the families called *oikos* and those called *oikia*, is plead upon the allegation that *oikos* literally denotes the dwelling place of the master or father of the house, and that *oikia* denotes the house, cabin, or hut, in which the servants or slaves lived. It is said that in their figurative application the same difference exists. As *oikos* signifies the master's dwelling house, it figuratively denotes his children: and as *oikia* denotes the

servant's house, it figuratively denotes the servants that lived in it. The jailer's house is called, verse 31, *oikos*; in v. 32, it is called *oikia*; and in v. 34, it is again called *oikos*. Once here it appears evidently to refer to the family, 'Thou shalt be saved, and thy house.' 'They spake the word of the Lord to all that were in his house, (*OIKIA*).' This evidently refers to the house, literally considered. And 34, 'He led them into his house,' (*OIKOS*) the place of abode. But whatever meaning we may fix to the word, it affects not the point for which we contend; for the fact still remains, and it is undeniable, that the jailer's house is called both an *oikos* and an *oikia*. Mr. M'Calla, or rather Mr. R. from whom the criticism is taken, aware that *oikia* is applied to the jailer's house, as well as *oikos*, will have it, contrary to appearance of probability, used metaphorically, and says that it means the jailer's servants, to whom he spake the word of the Lord. This is an evident assertion to suit the hypothesis. But suppose we should admit it for the sake of argument, then how does it stand? It stands thus, he preached to the servants, and baptized only the *oikos*, the infants!!! The *oikia* was not baptized, but the *oikos* was. Paul and Silas, then, were more successful in discipling the *oikos* than the *oikia*. Mr. R's infants, they were more easily converted than the servants. They spake the word of the Lord to all the jailer's servants, but not to his wife nor children, if he had any! Partial preachers these. Assuredly they were Paido-baptists!!" "We shall, for the sake of giving sufficient data to explode this absurd criticism, here register more circumstantially and methodically, a number of plain evidences or proofs of its falsehood. We shall first shew that *oikos* and *oikia* are used by the inspired penmen of the New Testament as completely synonymous. The Centurion's house, whose faith was so famed, and whose servant the Messiah cured, is, by Luke, in the VI. Chapter, called, verse 6th, *oikia*, and in verse 10th it is called *oikos*. The same house is by Matthew called *oikia*, Chap. viii. 6. Jairus, the ruler of the sy-

nagogue, whose daughter the Messiah brought to life, had a house, which Luke calls *oikos*, Chap. viii. 41; and in the same chapter, verse 51, he calls the same house *oikia*. Mark calls the same house *oikos*, Chap. v. 38, and Matthew calls it *oikia*, Chap. v. 23. In the parable concerning the house divided against itself, which is recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, it is called *oikia*, Matt. xii. 25, also *oikia*, Mark iii. 25, but it is called *oikos epi oikon*, Luke xi. 17. In the parable concerning the house being attacked by thieves, recorded by Matthew and Luke, Matthew calls it *oikia*, Chap. xxiv. 43, and Luke calls the same house *oikos*, Chap. xii. 39. The same house is called both *oikos* and *oikia* in the same verse, Luke x. 5. Into whatever house, (*oikia*) ye enter, say peace be to this house, (*oikos*.) The Messiah calls his Father's house both *oikos* and *oikia*, John ii. 16, and xiv. 2. The house of Martha and Mary is called *oikos*, John xi. 20, and in the same chapter it is called *oikia*, verse 31. These few instances, selected from the four Gospels only, will show how much dependence ought to be placed on such critics, the very foundation of whose criticisms is laid in a falsehood, viz. that *oikos* and *oikia* literally signify a house, but not the same kind of a house. We have produced from the very portion of the Bible where they say this distinction is observed with the greatest accuracy, unequivocal evidences that both words are used to denote the same kind of an house. Many instances more can be produced. We shall expose the fallacy of this new discovery a little farther. These sagacious Doctors of divinity say, that *oikia* literally signifies the servants' house, and metaphorically signifies the servants themselves. Thus Dr. Rallston, '*oikia* signifies a man's household or servants.' Let us test the correctness of this assertion. Matt. x. 12. Salute the house when ye enter it, (*oikia*) i. e. salute the servants only. Matt. x. 13. If the house, (*oikia*) be worthy, i. e. the servants. Matt. xii. 25. Every house divided, (*oikia*) i. e. servants, divided come to desolation. The Centurion, whose son Jesus healed, John iv.

50, believed, with all his house, (*oikia ole*) i. e. all his servants only believed. Matth. xiii. 57, A prophet hath no honour in his own house, (*oikia*) i. e. among his slaves or servants. Joshua said, as for me and my house, (*oikia*) we will serve the Lord, i. e. myself and my servants. Receive him not into your house, (*oikia*) i. e. into your kitchen among your servants. In every great house, (*oikia*) there are vessels of gold and silver, &c. i. e. in every great hut or cabin. In my Father's house, (*oikia*) are many mansions. I forbear to expose this criticism farther. Hundreds of instances similar to those adduced can be given. But we must not pass by the most important point, viz. that *oikos* signifies sometimes children, and even infants, apart from their parents. And what of this, ye sagacious critics! The word *family* in English, very often signifies the same thing! But does that prove any thing favourable to your hypothesis! So long as the word *family*, which you say is the meaning of *oikos*, frequently denotes all that live under one father, mother, master, or mistress, whether infants or adults, so long it remains to be determined, from the circumstances of the case, who are the constituents or members of the family; and thus, after all your boasted discovery, you have to confess yourselves to be just where you were; unable to prove that there ever was an infant in any house, *oikia*, or family that was baptized. But you intended to carry some point by the discovery, and we know of nothing you could propose, except to lead captive the ignorant and unwary admirers of THE PATENTED PRIESTHOOD. For, Gentlemen, you must know that *oikos* and *oikia* are used interchangeably in all books, and by all Greek writers, if you know any thing of Greek; and you must know, if you have read the Septuagint of the Old Testament, that *oikos* hundreds of times is applied to denote every kind of house or family. The very first time it occurs is Gen. vii. 1, where Noah is commanded to take all his house into the ark, *oikos*. Now we all know that Noah's *oikos* was composed of three other *oikoi*, and that each of these *oikos*

was composed of adults: four *oikoi* composed (*pas o oikos*) all the house of Noah. The youngest child or infant in this house (*oikos*) was about 98 years old. This same *oikos* occurs 14 times in the first chapter of Numbers, and includes under 12 occurrences 603,550 adults from 20 years and upwards. And so extremely far from truth and correctness is this criticism, that we can furnish instances where *oikos* signifies a man's servants. Thus Gen. xvii. 27, all the men of Abraham's house, *oikos*, of which there were 318 servants born in his *oikos*, were circumcised when Abraham's eldest son was 13 years old. Observe, not *oikia*, household, but *oikos*, house! But observe, God said of Abraham, he will order his children, (*hoi huioi*) and his household, *oikos*, yes, *oikos*, his servants, not *oikia*. Joseph was placed over the house of Pharaoh, (*oikos*,) i. e. over all his servants, noble and ignoble, Gen. xli. 40. Solomon gave Hiram 20,000 measures of wheat, and 20 measures of pure oil every year for the use, for the annual consumption of his *oikos*. Assuredly Hiram must have had many infants to consume all this!! Again, the whole house of Jacob is sometimes called *oikos*, and *pan oikia*, Gen. i. 22. xvi. 31, &c. &c. To round off this bold period of learned criticism, Mr. Rallston adds, 'It is true, indeed, that the English Translators have sometimes rendered both words *house*, and sometimes *household*, but the distinction is generally observed with accuracy,' (mark this,) and, adds he, 'certainly it would have been better to have uniformly rendered *oikos* *house*, and *oikia* *household*, as they have done, (once) Phil. iv. 22.' Now, courteous reader, [hearer,] don't be startled when I tell you that it is a fact that our Translators, in the New Testament, have only once translated *oikia*, *household*, and *oikos* three times, and that of forty three times *household* in the English Old Testament forty one times it is *oikos*, in the Septuagint, and only twice *oikia*!! When this is denied, we shall give chapter and verse. So speaks the Paidobaptist, and so speaks fact. Now judge ye. Thus I have shewn that the whole of this

criticism is a mere fabrication of an overweening imagination, say the best of it. Were it necessary I could fill, from Classical authority, a respectable pamphlet of refutations of this miserable refuge. But as the Old and New Testament were only referred to on this point, I confine myself exclusively to them," "and design it to stand here as a refutation of Taylor's, Rice's, Rallston's, and M'Calla's new theory of positive proof. I should except Mr. Rallston, for he only calls the argument derived from the family baptism, 'presumptive evidence' of apostolic practice. Mr. M'Calla presumes a little farther, and calls it positive proof. We will call it positive proof of positive presumption."^(u)

Thus has my Baptist Opponent entertained you. His ingenuity, wit, and severity, I leave you to admire. The charge of falsehood, which he has so liberally brought against Mr. Rallston, needs no other notice than to remind you, that it is merely grounded upon his holding a different opinion from my Opponent. Mr. Rallston thinks, that even when *oikos* and *oikia* are applied to the same tenement or the same domestic community, they do not mean the same part of that tenement or the same persons of that community. My Opponent boisterously asserts that they do mean the same, and that "any person that knows the Greek alphabet can see that" his opinion is right, and that Mr. Rallston or any other person who holds a different opinion is guilty of falsehood and lying, which charges are so agreeable to him in this sad dearth of argument, that he repeats them as often as three times in one breath.

Yet while my Opponent would thus stigmatize Mr. R. for a mere difference of opinion, ought he not to be more careful of his own statements as to matters of fact? In relation to this criticism on *oikos* and *oikia*, he has unreservedly asserted that "Mr. R." is the man "from whom

(u) This argument, chiefly elaborated since the real debate, is copied from Mr. Campbell's Spurious Report, where it will be found in the text and a large note of pp. 262—265. 278—283.

the criticism is taken.”(v) Now this whole audience, whether acquainted with the Greek alphabet or not, knows that I did not take it from Mr. R. They know also that the Pamphleteer does not even publish it as the production of Dr. Rice of Virginia, but as taken from Taylor, the Editor of Calmet’s Dictionary. With this fact my Opponent shews himself to be acquainted: for in a former speech he called it “the criticism of Rice and Taylor, on the words *oikos* and *oikia*”(w) Knowing this, what invectives could have conveyed his indignation against Mr. R. if Mr. R. himself had so far forgotten the truth, as to claim originality in this argument, or to assert that I had taken it from him? Yet an assertion, which, in the judgment of our Greek scholar, would have constituted Mr. R. guilty of falsehood and lying, my Opponent, to answer a purpose(x) can make, without a blush.

But whosoever originated this argument, my Opponent is determined that no one shall make it good, if he can prevent it, by prejudgments and arbitrary restrictions. He says, “Mr. M’Calla affirms, that there were “infants baptized in Lydia’s house, let him prove it “then. But it is impossible. *Ergo*, Mr. M’Calla affirms “that which he cannot prove.”(y) To make this undertaking impossible, as he thinks, he insists repeatedly and emphatically, that I must “prove POSITIVELY, that there were infants in this family.” By this word POSITIVELY, he means, according to the context, that I must find out Lydia’s husband, and the number, age, education, and residence of her children. Upon such terms as these, I should be glad to know how my Opponent

(v) Spurious Deb. p. 280. This and the context are copied above.

(w) Spurious Deb. p. 262, copied above.

(x) Mr. Campbell’s Spurious Debate divulges the reason of this wild statement. There it appears that he was not possessed of either Taylor’s or Rice’s, or my argument, and, therefore, copied Mr. Rallston’s for me. My Collateral Papers, published some time ago, shew, that this is only one of many “refuges of lies” to which he was driven by the scantiness of his materials and the badness of his cause.

(y) Spurious Debate, p. 266.

would set about proving POSITIVELY from the scriptures, that Tabitha, or any other female, was ever admitted to the Lord's table. Let him give us her name, in connexion with a direct statement of the fact, accompanied with the name of the administrator, and the time, place, and circumstances of the communion. After his declining this undertaking, as he certainly will, would you not think me a wonderful logician, to close the question of female communion, as he has done that of household baptism? Let us see how the argument would walk.

"My Opponent affirms that females communed with the Apostles.

Let him prove it then.

But it is impossible.

ERGO, my Opponent affirms that which he cannot prove!!"

If those whom my Opponent politely calls "*The Patented Priesthood*," were to compose such a syllogism, he would hardly give them credit for *patented powers* of reasoning. In opposition to this he would tell us, as he has done, that the communion was administered to disciples: *disciples* include *female* believers: *ergo*, the communion was administered to *female* believers. So we say, Baptism was administered to households: *households* include *infants*: therefore, baptism was administered to *infants*. Now the question in both these cases is this; Do *disciples* include females? Do *households* include infants? To shew that *households* do not embrace infants, my Opponent quotes Noah's *household* consisting of *eight adults without one infant*. Would he think it conclusive in the other question, to remind him, that the first company of communicants in the Christian church, consisted of *eleven or twelve DISCIPLES without one FEMALE*? Does this shew that disciples do not include females? My Opponent says, No. Then neither does the case of Noah, or any other case, shew that households do not embrace infants. To prove his point, my Opponent produces *one* passage of scripture, calling Tabitha a disciple. To prove mine, it will be conve-

nient to shew that infants belong to households, by as many authorities as your patience can endure: and after so much has been said on *oikos* and *oikia* by my Opponent, it is to be feared that indulgence will be almost as difficult for you, as it is necessary for me.

There are certain principles which are acknowledged, either expressly or practically, by all men of real learning, who undertake the explanation of words, whether in the scriptures or elsewhere. These principles my Opponent takes for granted, and to them he virtually appeals for a verdict in his favour. As they are really in *my* favour, an express recognition of them would be an advantage; and the time occupied in stating them would be compensated by their shewing the bearing of the evidence adduced. They shall be transcribed from Classical and Theological scholars, and among the latter, from Baptist as well as Pedobaptist authority. The celebrated Duke de Montausier, who was the first promoter of what we call the Dauphin edition of the Classics, used often to say that in "*The difficulties which occur to us in reading the works of the Ancients,*" arising "*from our not knowing in what sense they used such a word formerly,*" "*the commentator should endeavour to determine the meaning of the word in question, by consulting how it is used by the same author, in other places, where the meaning of it may be more evident; or by any other of the same country, and (as near as may be) of the same times.*"(z) On the same subject, the celebrated Thomas Hartwell Horne, in his Introduction to the Bible, directs us to "*ascertain the notion affixed to a word by the persons in general, by whom the language either is now or formerly was spoken, and especially in the particular connexion in which such notion is affixed.*" "*The meaning of a word used by any writer, is the meaning affixed to it by those for whom he immediately wrote. For there is a*

(z) Quoted in the Preface of Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, from Spence's Polymetis, p. 286.

kind of natural compact between those who write and those who speak a language ; by which they are mutually bound to use words in a certain sense : he, therefore, who uses such words in a different signification, in a manner violates that compact, and is in danger of leading men into error." "The received signification of a word is to be retained, unless weighty and necessary reasons require that it should be abandoned or neglected."^(a) To the same purport, the late Dr. Ryland, an eminent Baptist clergyman of England, says, "*Every word should be taken in its primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning, unless, there be something in the connexion, or in the nature of things, which requires it to be taken otherwise.*" "*Whenever, by the connexion of a term, or by the nature of things, we are obliged to depart from the primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning of a word, we should depart as little as possible from that meaning ; and even with reluctance.*"^(b) To these rules I have no objection, though an experienced polemic will easily perceive that in the construction of them, Dr. Ryland had his eye on the Baptist controversy. The same prejudice is so obvious in another rule, as to make it perfectly nugatory. It is as follows, viz. "*Whatever is expressed in scripture, is conclusive argument : whatever is not expressed, is not conclusive.*" If Dr. Ryland, or my Opponent, or any other person can shew that *female communion* is expressed in scripture, then I will shew that *infant baptism* is expressed there. But if they consider *the communion of disciples* an expression of female communion, then *the baptism of households* is an expression of infant baptism.

The application of the canons now read, to the matter in hand, is plainly this. There is a dispute about the meaning of the word *household*, as it is used a few times in the New Testament, in connexion with baptism. The question is, Does this word *household* include in-

(a) Horne's Introd. vol. 2. Part. 2. Chap. 2.

(b) Taylor's second publication of Facts and Evidences on the subject of Baptism. p. 23.

fants, as the word *disciples* includes *females*? We affirm; they deny. Both Baptists and Pedobaptists agree that it must embrace infants, if the following statements can be made good, viz. 1. The word *household* and its cognates, embrace infants, in the “primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning” of the words. 2. In the disputed passages, there is nothing connected with the word *household*, which requires it to be taken otherwise than in its “primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning.” 3. This was the meaning of the word *household*, among those for whom the authors of the disputed passages “*immediately* wrote.” 4. This was the meaning of the word *household* and its conjugates, in other writings of the same authors, and of cotemporary authors, and of former authors, Sacred and Profane, with whose writings they were more or less familiar. These positions, therefore, I shall, with divine assistance, endeavour to make good, in the examination of the following Greek words and phrases. Οικια, πανοικια, παγοικια, πασα παγοικια: Οικος, ὅλος οικος, πας οικος, πανοικεσια, παιοικιος, πανοικι, οικοδομια, οικοδομη, πασα οικοδομη, οικοδομειω. These we shall endeavour to consider, as they are used in relation to the *material* or *spiritual* HOUSE, the *ecclesiastical* or *celestial*, the *national* or *sectional*, the *royal* or *pontifical*, the *patriarchal* or *domestic* HOUSE: all of which, if we mistake not, will confirm and illustrate the doctrine, that a *household* includes infants, and that the *household* baptism of the New Testament is infant baptism.

You now see the scope of my argument, and you see what ought to be the scope of my Opponent’s argument. It is incumbent upon me to shew that οίκος, *house*, or *household*, and its kindred words, include infants. His object is properly to shew that they do not include infants. Yet is this the aim of the argument which he has actually given us? The greater part of his time and strength have been spent in trying to shew the identity of οίκος and οίκια. A Baptist preacher of England, Mr. Anderson, the learned antagonist of the Editor of Calmet’s Dictionary, has wasted his strength in the same

way. If this course is really calculated to defeat them in the main question, whether a household includes infants, then their argument lays no obstruction in my way, but is an actual assistance to me. Let us examine this matter for a moment. Among those passages which speak of a house divided against itself, Anderson shews that one Evangelist uses the word *oikos*, and two others use the word *oikia*. My Opponent has shown the same thing in your presence. If they have gained their point, they have established the identity of these words: but does this prove that neither of them includes infants? A more minute investigation will shew from the texts themselves, and from the comments and criticisms of my Opponent and other Baptists, that infants are included in both. One of these passages says, "If a *house*, ΟΙΚΙΑ, be divided against itself, that *house*, ΟΙΚΙΑ, cannot stand." (c) Instead of translating the word ΟΙΚΙΑ by *house*, my Opponent's New Testament, in both these places, renders it *family*; and Dr. Gill says that it means "any *family*, small or great." Now we know that the majority of *families*, both small and great, have infants, and that these infants are liable to be the greatest sufferers in domestic broils. Another of these texts says, "Every kingdom divided against itself, is brought to desolation; and, ΟΙΚΟΣ ΕΠΙ ΟΙΚΟΝ, a *house* divided against a *house* falleth." (d) But my Opponent's New Testament gives this quite another turn, as follows, viz. "By intestine broils any kingdom may be desolated, one *family*, ΟΙΚΟΣ, falling after *another*, ΟΙΚΟΝ." According to this translation, the name of *oikos* is expressly given to every *family* in the kingdom: for the kingdom is desolated in detail, *family* falling after *family*. Is it possible to find a kingdom whose families have no infants? This itself would soon bring them to desolation, if there were no divisions among them. But perhaps my Opponent means to deny the existence of infants in any of these *households* throughout the kingdom, however

(c) Mark iii. 25.

(d) Luke xi. 17.

numerous and fruitful their Lydia's may be, until, for the honor of the sex, we can obtain some account of their husbands, as he requires in the case of our converted Lydia. I hope you now see that instead of laying obstructions in our way, by his laborious criticisms on *oikos*, and *oikia*, he has aided in proving, that a *household*, whether called by the one Greek name or the other, ordinarily includes infants.

If I understand those who make a distinction between *oikos* and *oikia*, they consider the first as comprehending the children of the householder, and the second as including the rest of the family, particularly the servants. These appear to consider the servants as excluded from household baptism, because the New Testament says nothing of baptizing any person's *oikia*, but the *oikos* only. As this position was taken by some Pedobaptists, Mr. Anderson of England thought it, of course, his duty to say the very contrary. He accordingly makes a great display of learning to prove "that ΟΙΚΙΑ signifies *family*, exclusive of attendants;" and "that ΟΙΚΟΣ has the sense of *family*, including domestics."^(d) You may perhaps, ask how this will comport with my Opponent's very *positive* assertion that "there is no more difference betwixt the use and application of the words *oikos* and *oikia*, than there is between the words *brothers* and *brethren*:" yet, inconsistent as it may seem, Mr. Anderson also labours to prove that they are synonymous; and it does not lie in my way to dispute the matter with them. Household circumcision was administered to the infants of servants, as well as those of the master; because they were all to be *trained* up in the way they should go: and, as for the difficulty suggested by the circumcision of so many adults in Abraham's family, this is removed by inspired testimony; that they were already "*trained* up by him in religious exercises," as Dr. Gill expressly admits.^(e) On this subject I agree

(d) Taylor's pamphlet, entitled, "The Baptists Self-convicted, by the Rev. William Anderson," p. 30.

(e) Gen. xiv. 14.

with the sentiments expressed by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, A. D., 1786, and by our General Assembly, in the year 1816. The Act of the former reads thus: “ The following case of conscience from
 “ Donnegal Presbytery was overtured, viz. Whether
 “ Christian masters, or mistresses, ought in duty to have
 “ such children baptized, as are under their care,
 “ though born of parents not in the communion of any
 “ Christian church? Upon this overture Synod are of
 “ opinion, that Christian masters and mistresses whose
 “ religious professions and conduct are such, as to give
 “ them a right to the ordinance of baptism for their own
 “ children, may, and ought to, dedicate the children
 “ of their HOUSEHOLD to God, in that ordinance,
 “ when they have no scruple of conscience to the con-
 “ trary.” The subsequent Act of our General Assembly reads thus: “ The Committee to whom was referred
 “ the following question, viz. Ought baptism, on the
 “ profession and promise of the master, to be adminis-
 “ tered to the children of slaves? reported, and their
 “ report being amended, was adopted, and is as follows,
 “ viz. 1. That it is the duty of masters who are mem-
 “ bers of the church, to present the children of parents
 “ in servitude to the ordinance of baptism, provided
 “ they are in a situation to train them up in the nurture
 “ and admonition of the Lord, thus securing to them the
 “ rich advantages which the gospel provides. 2. That
 “ it is the duty of Christ’s ministers to inculcate this doc-
 “ trine, and to baptize all children of this description,
 “ when presented to them by their masters.”(f) Our
 church, then, has already agreed with my Opponent
 and Mr. Anderson in believing that *oikos*, *house* or
household, includes servants. That it certainly includes
 infants, we now proceed to prove, from the proposed
 examination of itself and the words related to it, in the
 following sections and particulars.

(f) Assembly’s Digest, pp. 96, 97.

I.

OIKIA.

This word has, in one instance at least, been the occasion of much stumbling to Baptists and Pedobaptists. This one instance is 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 16. “I beseech you, brethren, (Ye know the HOUSE of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the *ministry* of the saints,) that ye submit yourselves unto *such*, and to every one that helpeth with us, and laboureth.” On this passage an able writer of our own country, Dr. Rice, in his Pamphleteer,^(o) speaks as follows, viz. “I confess, however, that this passage, as it stands in the Original, presents difficulties in its grammatical structure, which I do not know well what to do with. I speak here not as a theologian or polemic, but simply as a grammarian. And adopt what system of doctrine I may, the difficulty presses on me: nor do I stand alone in this case. The harshness and difficulty of the Original has embarrassed every commentator that I have seen. The best solution of the sentence that I have met with, is to be found in the pamphlet already quoted, under the title of *Facts and Evidences on the subject of Baptism*.” Dr. Rice then gives a long extract from one of the able pamphlets of Taylor, the English Editor of Calmet’s Dictionary; a part of which reads as follows, viz. “The passage respecting the *household* of Stephanas is a tissue of difficulties. The first remark on it is, that, as it stands, it is neither Greek, grammar, nor common sense. It cannot be regularly construed. All commentators have felt this, and have attempted to force it into sense by supplementary words.” At last this eminent scholar concludes that we should drop from the text all that part of the 15th verse, which our Translators have enclosed

in parenthesis, and that we should consider it as only intended by the Apostle as a marginal note; but one which was unskilfully introduced into the text too early to leave any trace in our ancient manuscripts or versions. This conjectural emendation, he thinks absolutely necessary, to preserve the passage from the absurdity, of commanding the whole Corinthian church, and Stephanas among them, to submit to his *servants*, or, at best, his *children*, intended by *household*, as some think.

I confess myself utterly averse to taking such liberties with the Original text, merely because it appears harsh, ungrammatical, and hard to be understood. Would not this plan, generally and uniformly pursued, make a new bible? or, rather, would it not make bibles as numerous and various as the tastes and understandings of critics and commentators? This would certainly make sad work of our only infallible standard, not excepting that portion of it which was written by Paul, the penman of the text; in whose epistles, as Peter tells us, “are some things hard to be understood.”

I am inclined, however, to doubt, whether Peter would attribute this character to our text. The difficulty, with us, monstrous as it is said to be, appears to arise only from a slight inadvertency in interpreting the reference of a single word. The word *SUCH* in the 16th verse, may be understood to refer to one of two things in the 15th verse; that is, either *house* or *saints*. If to the former, then the passage is difficult: but if to the latter, it is easy and consistent. This will appear, I think, when the subject has received that patient investigation, which our highly respectable objectors have given to other passages of scripture.

If the word *SUCH* refer to the *house of Stephanas*, then the Apostle seems to require, that as the *household* or *children* of Stephanas had *ministered* to the *saints*, therefore, the church of Corinth, and even Stephanas himself, must *submit* to these children. This would teach, that where a *house* of children exercises a benevolent *ministry*, or *DEACONRY*, to Christians, they,

thereby, acquire a right to govern their parents, contrary to the Apostle's instructions to Timothy, that *Deacons* should have a character for "ruling their children and their own houses well;"^(o) instead of letting their houses rule them. Instead of this *ministration* to the saints giving a right to rule, the same Apostle, in the next epistle, declares, that it is itself an evidence of *submission*. "Whiles by the experiment of this DEACONRY, *ministration*, they glorified God for your professed HYPOTAGE, *submission*, to the gospel of Christ." It seems, therefore, that SUCH cannot refer to the *house* of Stephanas, as Christians are not required to submit to children.

If, however, we can lawfully construe the word SUCH, as referring to the *saints*, there is no difficulty in the matter; because the scriptures as uniformly require us to submit to saints, as to govern children. Peter says, "Likewise, ye younger, HYPOTAGETE, *submit* yourselves unto the elder: yea, all of you, HYPOTAS-SOMENOI, *submit yourselves one to another*."^(p) In accordance with this, Paul, the penman of our text, says to the Ephesian saints, "HYPOTASSOMENOI, *submitting, yourselves one to another, in the fear of God*."^(q) Let us now paraphrase the passage according to this view, reading the translation given by Macnight, and approved by my Opponent, and, (strange to tell,) copied into his New Testament. It is as follows, viz. "Ye know the *family* of Stephanas, that it is the first fruit of Achaia, and that they have devoted themselves to the DEACONRY, *ministry*, to the saints. I entreat you, therefore, brethren, that ye HYPOTASSESTHE, *submit yourselves to such*, [that is to the saints,] and to every joint worker and labourer, [in the gospel, especially.]"

This interpretation has the advantages of containing no monstrous sentiment, but a meaning which is perfectly scriptural; it preserves the text from any need of

(o) 1 Tim. iii. 12.

(p) 1 Pet. v. 5.

(q) Eph. v. 21.

jugulation; and it makes the pronoun *SUCH*, refer to a nearer and more natural antecedent, instead of one more remote. The amount of the passage is this; that Paul beseeches the Christians of Corinth to submit to the saints, by ministering to them, as the household of Stephanas had ministered to them, and thus submitted to them; and as all saints should submit to one another, and serve one another. This should remove the difficulty, on the part of the Pedobaptists.

But it was observed that the Baptists also stumble at this passage: for they insist that it proves that the *OIKIA*, *household*, of Stephanas, consisted of adults, who officiated as deacons, or preachers, or both. Admitting, then, that *oikos* and *oikia* have the same meaning, they consider this as proof that the baptized *oikos*, *household*, of Stephanas, consisted of these same adults, who officiated as deacons or preachers, or both. This conclusion, however, must rest upon one of two positions, both equally false. One is, that there is no other *ministration* allowed in the Scriptures, besides an official *deaconry*. But they might as well say that *submission* is always official, and that none but adults can yield submission and obedience. It may be easily shewn from Scripture that there are personal and pecuniary *ministrations* or *deaconries*, which the saints may and do receive from children. When Jesus went to Bethany, it is said, "There they made him a supper, and Martha DEACONIZED, served."^(o) Was hers an *official* deaconry? or was it above the capacity of children under thirteen years old, whom Jews and Christians consider subjects of infant circumcision and baptism? There are, probably, few of us who are not in the habit of seeing such ministrations from children, black and white, bond and free. Again; Paul says, "But now I go unto Jerusalem, to DEACONIZE, *minister*, unto the saints."^(p) If this pecuniary ministration was an official deaconry, then Paul held the office of a deacon in the church, although this

(o) Jno. xii. 2.

(p) Rom. xv. 25.

office was originally instituted for the relief of the Apostles, whose office was entirely distinct. Dr. Gill, therefore, praises the Apostle's condescension, in submitting to this inofficial ministration, "though this might seem "below his *office* as an *apostle*, and as what more became "an inferior *officer*, a *deacon* in the church." But if children may minister food to the saints, surely they may minister money also. Let the collectors of the sabbatical contributions in our churches say, whether children never throw in their mite. Many of us are acquainted with interesting anecdotes upon this subject; and they are becoming more common, as it is more common for parents to teach their children to give their pocket money to pious and benevolent objects, rather than for the mere gratification of their palate. Thus the first position of our opponents will not stand. And as for the second, that *household* always excludes infants, we hope to shew that this is equally untenable. To this we now more directly proceed.

The word *oikia*, now under consideration, often designates places or property. Such is thought to be the case, when our Saviour, as reported by three of the Evangelists, (g) censures the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees, for devouring widows' *houses*. Dr. Gill believes it to mean the goods deposited in their houses. My Opponent's New Testament, however, in all three of these places, renders it *families*; ye "devour the *families* of widows." Now if widows have infants, and these infants belong to their *families*, then infants are included in the word *oikia*, by the decision of my Opponent's own incomparable translation of the New Testament. Even where this word does signify property, it is apt to be that sort which has infant tenants. The Septuagint uses this word for those "*tents*" in which the "plain man" Jacob was said to dwell. (h) We all know what sort of a *family* Jacob had, to occupy these tents. This

(g) Matt. xxiii. 14. Mark xii. 40. Luke xx. 47.

(h) Gen. xxv. 27.

word is used in that text also, which says, “As for the stork, the fir-trees are her *house*.” Now we know that the *house* or *nest* of birds is usually built for no other end than the accommodation of their *young*. Indeed Mr. Thomson, a favourite translator of my Opponent, considers these directly intended in the text. His translation of the Septuagint says “The *family* of the stork account them their own.” Akin to these texts is that one which says, “But in a great *house*, there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honour, and some to dishonour.”(i) This great *house* is literally the place and the property of the owner: but Gill considers it a figure of the church. Whether this great house contains any small vessels or not, may be learned from the same Apostle, who spoke to the Corinthians, “even as unto *babes* in Christ;”(j) and said to the Hebrews, “Every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a *babe*.”(k) Passing over many instances in which this word *directly* denotes families with infants, we shall only specify two or three. Moses says to Israel, “Thou shalt rejoice in every good thing which the Lord thy God hath given unto thee, and unto thine *house*.”(l) Dr. Gill explains it, “To them and their *families*, by which they were comfortably provided for.” Here the word is applied to every *family* in that miraculously fruitful nation, and is used in connexion with that provision which God made for the youngest infants in those *families*; with which the parents are said to rejoice, as the jailer did with all his *house*. Jeremiah said to Zedekiah, “and thou shalt live, and thy *house*.”(m) Dr. Gill says, “not only himself, but his wives and *children* and *servants*.” It appears, then, that *oikia* is used in the Greek Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to include children and servants. The same thing appears more glaring, if possible, in that passage in which Joseph says to his brethren, “Fear not; I will nourish you and your

(i) 2 Tim. ii. 20.

(j) 1 Cor. iii. 1.

(k) Heb. v. 13.

(l) Deut. xxvi. 11.

(m) Jer. xxxviii. 17.

OIKIAS, *households*.”(n) The Hebrew word(o) which is here translated OIKIAS by the Septuagint, is a collective noun, signifying, as Parkhurst says, “*young children*.” Calasio explains it by “CÆTUS SEU MULTITUDO PUERORUM ET INFANTIUM, a *collection or multitude of children and infants*.” The latter, with the Vulgate and Tremellius, has rendered it in the text, by the word PARVULOS, *little ones*; exactly the rendering of our English Bible, “I will nourish you and your *little ones*.” The manner in which the word is used throughout the Scriptures, proves this to be its real meaning. Robinson, after his fashion, would make them all young men and women, as he does the “*little ones*” of Tertullian: but Ezekiel expressly distinguishes these “*little children*” as our translation has it, from old men and women, from young men and maids.(p) And the history preceding our text, speaks of these little ones as nurslings which need to be carried in waggons, with their mothers and the aged Patriarch Jacob. Pharaoh says, “Take you waggons out of the land of Egypt, for your *little ones*, and for your wives, and bring your father, and come.” “And Jacob rose up from Beer-sheba; and the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father, and their *little ones*, and their wives, in the waggons which Pharaoh had sent to carry him.”(q) It is no wonder, therefore, that when Joseph promises to nourish them and their *oikias*, Dr. Gill should explain it, as he has done, in the following words, viz. “*I will nourish you and your LITTLE ONES*; provide food for them and their *families*, not “only for themselves and their sons, now grown up, but “their grand children, and even *the youngest and latest of their families* should share in his favours.” In this instance the Septuagint uses OIKIA not as a general term including *infants*, but as a particular and distinct designation of *infants*. If, then, as Mr. Anderson and my Opponent alledge, OIKIA and OIKOS are synonymous, OIKOS also must designate *infants*; and the *household* baptism of the New Testament be *infant* baptism.

(n) Gen. i. 21.

(p) Ez. ix. 6.

(o) טף

(q) Gen. xlv. 19. xlv. 5.

II.

PANOIKIA.

Taylor quotes from Apocryphal Greek, that Haman was “hanged at the gates of Susa, SUN TE PANOIKIA, “*with all his household;*”(s) among whom were ten sons. This was in consequence of Esther’s obtaining a decree, empowering “the Jews which were in every “city, to gather themselves together, and to stand for “their life, to destroy, to slay, and to cause to perish, “all the power of the people and province that would “assault them, both *little ones* and women.”(t) This decree was intended as an offset to a preceding one “to “destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish, all Jews, both “*young* and old, *little children* and women.”(u) It must be evident to every candid and intelligent person, that it was Haman’s intention to destroy every Jewish subject with his whole *household*, “*young* and old, *little children* and women;” that it was the intention of Mordecai and Esther to destroy every assailant, with his “LITTLE ONES and women:” in consequence of which retaliation, thousands of infants actually perished, some of whom most probably belonged to the numerous *panoikia* of Haman.

III.

PAROIKIA.

“Now these are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt; every man and his *household* came with Jacob.”(v) For *household* here the Septuagint reads PAROIKIA.(w) Dr. Gill considers it as embracing “their families, wives, *children*, and servants.” After the armed adventurers of the tribe of Dan had secured Micah’s priest, it is said “They turned and de-

(s) Apocryphal Esther xvi. 18. (Gr. 12.) in Bap. Self-convict. p. 45.

(t) Esther viii. 11. (u) Esth. iii. 13. (v) Ex. i. 1.

(w) I observe that the Margin of Calasio reads *panoiki*. This is the reading of Grab: but the Septuagint of Wechelius, and the Venetian edition, both weighty, read *paroikia*.

parted, and put the *little ones* and the cattle and the carriage before them.”(x) Dr. Gill believes that these predatory emigrants carried their wives with them, though they are not mentioned. As for these “*little ones*,” the Doctor considers them their “*children*.” “*Little ones*” is a literal translation of the Hebrew,(y) and is an exact accordance with the *parvulos* of the Latin Vulgate, of Junius and Tremellius, of Trommius, and of Sebastian Castallio. The Vatican Septuagint has TA TEKNE, *children*, a good rendering, though a bad reading. Grab has a better reading, *panoikia*; and best of all, the Aldine Septuagint reads *paroikia*. This reading is reported by Calasio, in the margin of his Hebrew Concordance, and found in the text of the Francfort Septuagint, used by Kircher and Trommius in their Concordances to the Septuagint. Here then, is an instance in which this ancient version uses *paroikia*, not as a general term including *infants*, but as a particular and distinct designation of *infants*. The conclusion to which analogy would lead us is obvious.

IV.

PASA PAROIKIA OR PANOIKIA.

The first is the reading of the Francfort edition, and the second of the Vatican and others, in Gen. l. 22. “And “Joseph dwelt in Egypt, he and his brethren, and *all* “his father’s *numerous household*.” Dr. Gill says, “Not only he but his brethren and their *families*.” The preceding verse shews that these families were composed, in great part, of “*little ones*,” there called *oikia*. These infants, then, must, of course, be included in *pasa panoikia*, which appears intended to magnify *oikia* doubly.

V.

OIKOS.

Like *oikia* this sometimes signifies *property*, BONA, FACULTATES, as Hedericus explains it. The Lord said

(x) Judg. xviii. 21.

(y) טף

to David, "I gave thee thy Master's *house*." (z) Gill says "his family, his wives, servants, wealth and riches." Solomon says, "If a man would give all the substance of his *house* for love, it would utterly be contemned." (a) So the thief "shall give all the substance of his *house*." (b) So Jehoram's enemies "carried away all the substance that was found in the king's *house*." (c) Pharaoh says to Joseph, "Thou shalt be over my *house*." (d) Gill says, "have the care of his domestic affairs, and be the principal man in his palace and court." While with Potiphar, Joseph said, "Behold my master wotteth not what is with me in the *house*." (e) Gill says, "what goods or money are in it." Concerning the dinner which Joseph gave to his brethren, he gave orders "to the ruler of his *house*." Gill says, "his steward;" and so Moses calls him in the context. (f) The steward of the house was to take care of the property which was in the house. But when this word denotes the building itself, and still more when it is applied to persons, it illustrates and confirms the doctrine that household baptism is infant baptism, as we shall see in the following particulars.

1. *The Material or Mechanical House.* For a few examples we would refer to the *house* of Zacharias and Mary; (g) the *house* which the owner suffered to be broken through; (h) the king's *house*, and *houses* of the people, which the Chaldeans burned with fire. (i) They burnt moreover the *house* of the Lord, which was a figure of the church, with all its members, infant and adult. (j) Our Translators have once rendered οἶκος, *temple*; (k) and where they say, "Your *house* is left unto you desolate," (l) Gill considers it as including "the

(z) 2 Sam. xii. 8.

(a) Cant. viii. 7.

(b) Prov. vi. 31.

(c) 2 Chr. xxi. 17.

(d) Gen. xli. 40—4. So Gen. xlv. 8. and Acts vii. 10.

(e) Gen. xxxix. 8.

(f) Gen. xliii. 16. 19. So Gen. xxxix. 4. 5. Ps. cv. 21.

(g) Luke i. 40. 56.

(h) Luke xii. 39.

(i) Jer. xxxix. 8.

(j) Jer. lii. 13.

(k) Luke xi. 51.

(l) Matt. xxiii. 38.

“*temple*, formerly the *house* of God, but now only “*theirs*.” With the burning of this *house*, Ezekiel expressly connects the slaying of their sons and daughters;(*m*) and the Septuagint considered Ezra as implicitly recognizing this connexion, when he calls it “The “*house* of the great God, which is builded with *elect* “stones,”(*n*) according to their rendering. As they have here called the constituents of the material temple, *elect stones*, so they have elsewhere applied the epithet *elect*, to the foundation and chief-corner stone of the spiritual temple.(*o*) In this they are copied by the Apostle Peter, where he speaks of the spiritual *house* being built up of *lively stones*.(*p*) It is evident, therefore, that the building of the material *house* of elect stones, is intended to illustrate the building of the spiritual house of elect stones, and of infants, of course, if there be any elect infants. That there are elect infants, is admitted even by the most rigid Calvinists; among whom I desire always to be ranked. On this subject my sentiments are exactly expressed by our excellent Confession.(*q*) As almost all errorists believe in the universal election of infants, both sides should agree that they belong to this house.

2. *The Spiritual House*. Paul says of Christ, that he is a faithful ruler “a son over his own *house* ; “whose *house* are we, if we hold fast the confidence and “the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.”(*r*) The angel said to Mary, “He shall reign over the *house* of “Jacob forever.”(*s*) Dr. Gill says, “As his father “David reigned over the Idumeans, Syrians, and others, “as well as over the *house* of Judah, and Israel, so this “his son shall reign over both Jews and Gentiles : his “kingdom shall be from one end of the earth to the “other, even over all the elect of God.” Now if there are infants to be found among “Jews and Gen- “tiles ;” if there are infants to be found “from one

(*m*) Ez. xxiii. 47.

(*o*) Isa. xxviii. 16.

(*q*) Chap. 10. Sect. 3.

(*n*) Ezr. v. 8.

(*p*) 1 Pet. ii. 5. 6.

(*r*) Hebr. iii. 6.

(*s*) Luke i. 33.

“end of the earth to the other;” and if there are infants to be found among “all the elect of God;” then, according to this commentary of the great Dr. Gill, infants must be included in that “house of Jacob,” over which Christ shall reign for ever. The fact that every converted adult becomes a spiritual infant in regeneration, will be found, on examination, to be more for us than against us. In relation to this spiritual birth, the scriptures speak as follows. “Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate, than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord.”(t) In reference to this desolate church it is said, “God setteth the solitary in families,(u) Gill understands this of converts, who “are “set in families, or placed in gospel churches, which, “as families, have a master over them, who is Christ the “Son and first born, of whom they are named; where are “saints of various ages, sizes, and standing; some fathers, “some young men, and some *children*.” Paul had to speak to the Corinthians, “even as unto babes in “Christ.”(v) To the Hebrews he said, “For every “one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe.”(w) Concerning the excellent woman, Solomon says, “She riseth also while it is yet night; and giveth meat to her *household*, and a portion to her maidens.”(x) Dr. Gill says that “spiritually may be meant by her household or family, the “same with the family of Christ, that is named of himself, which consists of various persons, fathers, young “men and children.” As to the maidens, the ministers, these are to distribute “milk indeed to babes, and meat “to strong men.” Of this same woman, Solomon says, “She is not afraid of the snow for her *household*; for “all her *household* are clothed with scarlet.”(y) Gill

(t) Isa. liv. 1. Comp. Gal. iv. 26. 27.

(u) Ps. lxviii. 6.

(v) 1 Cor. iii. 1.

(w) Hebr. v. 13.

(x) Prov. xxxi. 15.

(y) Prov. xxxi. 21.

admits that this passage has a literal meaning, and that of course, literal infants are included in this woman's household: but when he spiritualizes it, and considers the scarlet clothing as pointing to Christ's blood, does he mean that no literal infants have the benefit of this crimson covering? Certainly not. Then, as I said before, the fact that adults become spiritual infants by regeneration, by no means refutes the doctrine that there are literal infants in the spiritual *household*, but rather establishes it. When Peter says, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house,"(z) Gill says that these lively stones "lie in the same quarry, and "are the same by nature, as the rest of mankind, till "dug out and separated from thence, by the powerful "and efficacious grace of God." Now I would ask, are there no literal infants in nature's quarry? and are there no literal infants which are "dug out from thence "by the powerful and efficacious grace of God?" You will answer, Yes. Then there are literal infants belonging to the *spiritual house*. But the Doctor believes that there is a *spiritual house* of Antichrist as well as of Christ. When Solomon says, "The Lord will destroy the *house* of the proud,"(a) Gill understands it generally, as including all proud persons, "their families, their children, and posterity;" and particularly, "the *house* of the foolish and adulterous woman, the "idolatrous church of Rome." Now I ask, are there no infants in the families, children, and posterity of the proud? Are there no infants in the *house* of the Roman Harlot? The Anabaptists say that infant baptism is a main pillar of Popery. Yet they themselves must and do acknowledge that the *spiritual house* of Christ has infants, as certainly as the *spiritual house* of Antichrist. Analogy, therefore, would teach us that household baptism is really infant baptism; although we should be very far from following the Roman Antichrist in their corruptions of this ordinance.

(z) 1 Pet. ii. 5.

(a) Prov. xv. 25.

3. *The Ecclesiastical House.* Several texts quoted on the *spiritual house*, are instances which apply, primarily and literally, to the *domestic house* hereafter to be considered : but Dr. Gill, by an allowable allegorizing, applies them to the invisible church, and also, in general, to the visible church, the *ecclesiastical house*. On that passage in which Solomon's woman "giveth meat to her household, and a portion to her maidens;" Gill says, "It is by these the church gives meat to her household." When Solomon says, "He maketh the barren woman to keep house, and to be a joyful mother of children." Gill says, "This may be applied to the church of God, as it is to the congregation of Israel by the Targum." But if this application be made, it must recognize literal infants in the church of God; for they belong to the congregation of Israel; and they are certainly included in the house here mentioned, in the literal sense of the passage, according to an express statement of Dr. Gill, which we may take a future opportunity of quoting. The membership of infants in the Jewish and Christian churches alike, shews itself plainly, to one who traces through the New Testament, this important word *household*. "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."(b) Here the Jewish and Christian societies are considered as one household, built upon a common foundation, and united by a common corner. But it is certain that household circumcision was infant circumcision; and if the Jewish household included infants, why not the Christian household? It is said moreover, that "Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after." Dr. Gill says, "He was not a servant in the world, and with respect to civil things, and the affairs of Providence, but in the

(b) Eph. ii. 19—22,

“*church of God*,” even “in the *house of Israel*, or “among that people which were the *Lord’s family*.”(c) Whether the “*Lord’s family*,” as it existed in the “*house of Israel*” had infants or not, judge ye. It is undeniable that infants did belong to the *Jewish ecclesiastical house*. But Paul’s words which immediately follow those just now quoted, prove the identity of the *Jewish* and the *Christian ecclesiastical house*: “But Christ as a Son over his own *house*, whose *house* are *we*.”(d) In the preceding verse, Dr. Gill could see plainly that an *ecclesiastical house* was meant: His commentary would have been more correct and perspicuous, if he had told us the same of this last verse, which belongs to the same sentence; especially when the same Apostle tells a Christian minister how to behave himself “in the *house of God*, which is the *church* of the living God.”(e) But there is reason to suppose that the Doctor meant a church, when he spoke of a *spiritual house*, as he does in his exposition of Peter’s “*spiritual house*,” where he says, “These living stones, being laid and cemented together, in a *gospel church-state*, become “the *house of God* in a spiritual sense.”(f) In conformity with these views, the *ecclesiastical house* to which I belong, considers itself a spiritual house built upon a spiritual foundation. In speaking of the judicatories of the church, our Constitution says, “These assemblies ought not to possess any civil jurisdiction, nor to inflict any civil penalties. Their power is wholly *moral* or *spiritual*, and that only ministerial and declarative.”(g) Accordingly they say, “There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ:”(h) even he of whom it is said, “The stone which the builders refused, is become the head stone of the corner.”(i) Gill tells us that those rejectors

(c) Gill on Hebr. iii. 5. and Num. xii. 7.

(d) Hebr. iii. 6.

(e) 1 Tim. iii. 15.

(f) Gill on 1 Pet. ii. 5.

(g) Form of Gov. Chap. 8. Sect. 2.

(h) Confess. of Faith. Chap. 25. Sect. 6.

(i) Ps. cxviii. 22.

are “those who were the support of their civil state, “and the maintainers of it; but more especially their “*ecclesiastical builders*.” “They refused to make use “of him in the spiritual building.” This spiritual *ecclesiastical* house in which the Jews refused to use this head corner stone, had infants, beyond all contradiction; and one instance in which they rejected him from their building, was, when “All the people answered and “said, His blood be on us and on our “*children*.”(j) Dr. Gill says, “It is a notion of the Jews, that the guilt of “innocent blood, and the blood of that innocent man’s “children, lie not only upon the persons immediately “concerned but upon their children to the end of the “world.” “This imprecation of theirs has been notoriously verified in them.” “On the generality of “them his blood was, in the sense they wished it.” “And to this day this dreadful wish of the blood of “Christ upon them is to be seen in their miserable, abject and captive state; and will be, until such time “as they look to him whom they have pierced and “mourn.” This appears to be contemplated by that prediction that “Judgment must begin at the *house* of “God.”(k) When this judgment did begin, the infants of this *house* of God were in some cases actually eaten by their own mothers, as we are informed both by scripture prophecy and the history of Josephus. But before this just and dreadful judgment against the Old Testament *ecclesiastical house*, with its adults and infants, Christ came “unto the lost sheep of the *house of Israel*,”(l) with its adults and infants: and he is still “an High Priest over the *house of God*,”(m) with its “adults and infants, and “he shall reign over the *house of Jacob* forever:”(n) for even in the New Testament dispensation, “the promise is unto you and to your “children.”

(j) Matt. xxvii. 25.

(l) Matt. xv. 24.

(n) Luke i. 33.

(k) 1 Pet. iv. 17.

(m) Hebr. x. 21.

4. *The Celestial House.* The Septuagint makes Job say, “*Hades* is my *oikos*.”(o) If the unseen world is here meant, it must be that state of departed spirits in which Job’s Redeemer lived.(p) There must certainly be infants there. Whether Job referred to this happy rest or not, we know that our Saviour did, in a passage where the evangelist uses a word, which my Opponent says differs from *oikos*, no more than *brothers* differs from *brethren*. He says, “In my Father’s οΙΚΙΑ, *house*, “are many mansions.”(q) Some of the mansions in this *house* must certainly have infant tenants. So Paul says, “We have a building of God, an οΙΚΙΑ, *house*, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.”(r)

5. *The National House.* As the passages to be adduced under this particular, can hardly be understood without the doctrine of imputation, it will be well to remember a few plain authorities in support of this important scriptural truth. Concerning the wicked, Job says, “God layeth up his iniquity for his children.”(s) Dr. Gill says, “God does not punish them [the wicked] “now for their sins in their own persons, yet he will “punish them in their children, for whom he reserves “the punishment of their iniquity.” “And when they “have filled up the measure of their fathers’ sins, by “their own transgressions, the deserved punishment “shall be inflicted, according to Ex. xx. 5.” The Lord said to Israel, “But as for you, your carcasses, they shall “fall in this wilderness. And your children shall wander in the wilderness forty years, and bear your “whoredoms;”(t) that is, “the punishment of their “idolatries,” as Dr. Gill says; for, says he, “It was “on account of them, their children wandered so long “in the wilderness.” Jeremiah, in speaking for his people, says, “Our fathers have sinned, and are not, and “we have borne their iniquities;”(u) that is, according to Dr. Gill, “the punishment of them, or chastisement

(o) Job xvii. 13.

(r) 2 Cor. v. 1.

(u) Lam. v. 7.

(h) Job xix. 25.

(s) Job xxi. 19.

(q) Jno. xiv. 2.

(t) Num. xiv. 32, 33.

“ for them : this is not said by way of complaint, much less as charging God with injustice, in punishing them for their fathers’ sins, or to excuse theirs, for they were ready to own that they had consented to them, and were guilty of the same ; but to obtain mercy and pity at the hands of God.” How different this language of the great and pious Baptist Commentator, from that of the impious and Deistical Robinson, my Opponent’s master ; and, at present, the darling of the Baptist church!! The same doctrine is plainly taught in the following passages. “ Prepare slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers ; that they do not rise, nor possess the land, nor fill the face of the world with cities.”(v) Millions of infants thus perished in “ the nations whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel ;”(w) and afterward in the Jewish nation itself, concerning which, Christ said, “ All these things shall come upon this generation.”(x) The same is true of Babylon, which, in one place, Jeremiah calls “ that nation,”(y) in another, “ the daughter of Babylon ;”(z) in which latter place the Septuagint uses οἶκος, *house*, for *daughter*. That all these national houses are full of infants cannot be denied. It is remarkable that the Septuagint often puts the word *house* for *children*, and *children* for *house*. Thus, when the Original reads “ O children of Israel !” the Septuagint reads “ O *house* of Israel !”(a) When the Original condemns Mount Sier for slaughtering “ the *children* of Israel,” the Septuagint has it “ the *house* of Israel :”(b) in which national house, infants are certainly included ; as in many other instances of a similar description ; in one of which, while the Septuagint has οἶκος, *house*, other Greek translators, (as Trommius shews,) use νῦνιοι, *children* ;(c) thus shewing, that *house* and *children* were interchangeable terms. This is farther confirmed from the

(v) Isa. xiv. 21. (w) 2 Kings xxi. 9. (x) Matt xxiii. 36.

(y) Jer. xxv. 12. (z) Jer. li. 33. (a) Am. iii. 1.

(b) Ez. xxxv. 5. (c) Ez. ii 3. For other cases alledged, see Ez. xxxvii. 21. Jer. xxiii. 7. xvi. 14. Ez. xlv. 9. xxxvii. 21.

other fact just mentioned; that where *house* is in the Original, the word *children* is often found in the Septuagint. When Ezekiel distributes his two sticks to the two nations into which the twelve tribes had been long divided, he assigns one to "all the *house* of Israel," or to the "*children*" of Israel,(d) according to the Septuagint, in such a way as to embrace every infant in the nation. Many other instances of this rendering also are at hand.(e) Analogous to this ancient way of translating Hebrew into Greek, is the way in which the Ancients rendered Greek into Syriac; when speaking not of the *national*, but of the *domestic house*, whether this domestic house be designated by *oikos* or *oikia*, or *panoiki*, and whether the children of this house be mere *infants*, or *children* of an age to hear the gospel and receive instruction, yet young enough to be *discipled* upon the faith of their parents. In the New Testament we are told that Paul and Silas spoke the word of the Lord to the jailer "and to all that were in his ΟΙΚΙΑ, *house*." The Syriac Translation says, "to all *the children of his house*." Immediately after we are told that the jailer "rejoiced, believing in God, ΠΑΝΟΙΚΙ, *with all his house*." The Syriac says, "and, or then, rejoiced both he and all *the children of his house*, in the faith of God." In the same chapter it is related that Lydia "was baptized and her οίκος, *house*." The Syriac says "and *the children of her house*."(f) That this was done upon her faith, is evident from the language of her invitation to her instructors, which my Opponent says, "is the most singular invitation on record."(g) He may well be amazed at the whole transaction; since it not only proves, that through Lydia's faith, she and her household was baptized, but gives us reason to believe, that the joy of the jailer's household, was just that sort of happiness which must have been diffused through the household of Lydia, and is generally communicated to

(d) Ez. xxxvii. 16. (e) Joshua xxi. 45. Lev. xvii. 3. xxii. 18. 2 Sam. vi. 5. Jer. ii. 26. Ez. iii. 1. xii. 24. iv. 3.

(f) Acts xvi. 15. 32. 34. (g) Spurious Debate with me, p. 265.

the household of a pious Pedobaptist, through the faith of the head, and the covenant blessings of the baptized members.

6. *The Sectional House.* As the whole *nation* was called a *house*, so was each *section* or *tribe*. To decide the dispute concerning Aaron's priesthood, the Lord commanded Moses to "Speak unto the children of Israel, "and take of every one of them a rod, according to the "house of their fathers, of all their princes, according "to the *house* of their fathers, twelve rods."(*h*) These twelve rods were for the twelve tribes or twelve *sectional houses* into which the *national house* of Israel was distributed. That each of these *houses* had a great proportion of infants, will not probably be disputed; especially as we can give an authentic account of their twelve fathers, which my Opponent thinks so important in the case of Lydia? In this sense *oikos* occurs in the Septuagint as often as fifteen times in one Chapter. In one of these places, God says, "Take ye the sum of all the "congregation of the children of Israel, after their families, by the *house* of their fathers."(*i*) Gill says, "*After their families*; into which their *tribes* were divided: *by the house of their fathers*; for if the mother "was of one *tribe*, and the father of another, the family "was according to the *tribe* of the father, as Jarchi "notes, a mother's family being never called a family, "as Aben Ezra observes." Out of these *sectional houses* Moses made a selection of such as were over twenty years and not superannuated, nor otherwise unfit for war. The selection shews that the million of children from whom they were drafted, belonged to the *houses* as well as themselves. This passage my Opponent has treated in the following artful manner, viz. "This same *oikos* "occurs 14 times in the first chapter of Numbers, and "includes under 12 occurrences, 603,550 adults from "20 years and upwards."(*j*) This sweeping declaration was made in such a way as to strike your minds with

(*h*) Num. xvii. 2. 3.

(*i*) Num, i. 2.

(*j*) Spurious Debate with me, p. 282, Note.

the impression that these twelve *houses* were composed of adults only, and that the *including*, of which he speaks, referred to the sum of the twelve particulars, each of which consisted of male adults *exclusively*. If so, it would be a far more brilliant case than the *house* of Noah, which consisted of eight adults without one infant; and far more impressive than the family of Christ, which consisted of more than eight DISCIPLES, without one *female communicant*. But on examination, it turns out far otherwise. Instead of these warriors constituting the *tribe*, *family*, and *house* of their fathers, they were, as Dr. Gill says, only “all IN every *tribe*, *family*, and “*house*, that were above 20 years of age, healthful and “strong, and fit for war.” In this respect, they resembled the twelve princes who drafted them. Instead of their composing the *house* themselves as Noah’s adults did, it seems, according to Moses, that “each one was for the house of his fathers;” as Dr. Gill says, “FOR “the *tribe* he belonged to, with which it might reasonably be supposed he was best acquainted, and could “more readily take the number of them.”(k) At a subsequent period of the Jewish history it is said that Nashon was a “Prince of the *oikos* of Judah.”(l) Now it may be asked, were there any infants in this *oikos*? and did or did they not owe allegiance to Nashon as members of the *oikos* over which he was a prince? In this place the Hebrew reads *children* instead of *house*, as the Septuagint reads *children* in several other places where the sectional “*house*” is found in the Original, embracing infants in it.(m)

7. *The Royal House*. Under this particular we have again to notice the punishment of children and grand children for the sins of parents. The Lord told David that the famine was “for Saul and his bloody *house*; “because he slew the Gibeonites.” On which account, long after Saul was dead, the Gibeonites said that they would not accept a pecuniary ransom “of Saul, nor of

(k) Gill on Num. i. 44. 45.

(l) 1 Chr. ii. 10.

(m) See Joshua xvii. 17. xviii. 5. Ez. xxv. 12. Hos. i. 7.

“his *house*,”(n) but demanded that seven of that house should be executed by way of retaliation. Five of the seven were Saul’s grandchildren, the sons of his daughter Michal, by Barzillai. Concerning the royal son of Nebat, God says, “I will bring evil upon the *house* of Jeroboam,” “and will take away the remnant of the *house* of Jeroboam.” In this *house* there was a child, concerning which it is said, “All Israel shall mourn for him and bury him; for he only of Jeroboam shall come to the grave, because in him there is found some good thing, towards the Lord God of Israel in the *house* of Jeroboam.”(o) When God said to David, “The sword shall never depart from thy *house*,” “I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own *house*,” he says, “the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die:”(p) leaving us to conclude that this child belonged to his *house*, as the child of Jeroboam belonged to his *house*. When God said by the Prophet Amos, “I will rise against the *house* of Jeroboam,”(q) Gill considers it to mean “the *family* of Jeroboam.” When it is said that Zimri “slew all the *house* of Baasha,”(r) Gill says that it means “his whole *family*, all the children that he had;” and “not only his *posterity*, but all any way *related* to him.” Were there no infants related to him? When it is said that “Jehu was executing judgment upon the *house* of Ahab,”(s) Gill says that this royal *house* of Ahab included “Joram his son and seventy more sons.” Strange if there were no infants among them! When Nathan said to David, “The Lord telleth thee that he will make thee an *house*.”(t) this *house* prominently contemplated an infant yet to be born. The very next verse says, “I will set up thy *seed* after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.” From the first of these verses, Gill understands that God will “not only

(n) 2 Sam. xxi. 1. 4.

(o) 1 King, xiv. 10. 13. Comp. xv. 29.

(p) 2 Sam. xii. 10. 11. 14.

(q) Am. vii. 9.

(r) 1 Kgs. xvi. 11. 12.

(s) 2 Chr. xxii. 8.

(t) 2 Sam. vii. 11. Comp. 12—16.

“ build up his *family* and make that *numerous*, [by “ giving him many infants, of course,] but establish the “ *house* of his kingdom.” The next he says “ has regard to a future *son of his not yet born*; not Absalom nor Adonijah, nor any of the rest born in Hebron “ were to succeed him in the kingdom, but *one as yet “ unborn.*” It will not do to say that this prophecy contemplated this unborn son as grown to maturity, and fit to reign, before he belonged to his father’s *royal house*. There is incontrovertible evidence at hand that he belonged to his father’s *royal house* the moment that he was born. This evidence is contained in a prophecy concerning one of his *royal* successors: viz. “ Behold, a child shall be *born unto the house* of David, Josiah by name.”(u) But these prophecies contemplate ultimately that King who is the Root and offspring of David, whom Dr. Gill considers as introduced into the *house* of David from the moment of his conception. The rapturous song of Zacharias tells us that God “ hath raised up an horn of salvation for us, in the “ *house* of his servant David.”(v) Gill says, “ In David’s *family*, he being now *conceived* by a virgin of “ *his house*, and who, in a little time, *would be born* in “ Bethlehem the city of David.” There is no need, therefore, to go in search of Lydia’s husband, or of the jailer’s wife, in order to tell what sort of *houses* they were, which were baptized upon the faith of the parents.

8. *The Pontifical or Sacerdotal House.* Eli, the High Priest, of the house of Ithamar, was addressed as follows; “ Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, “ I said indeed that thy *house* and the *house* of thy father should walk before me forever: but now the “ Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honour “ me I will honour, and they that despise me, shall be

(u) 1 Kgs. xiii. 2. To this add 1 Chr. xvii. 25. 2 Sam. vii. 27. 1 Kgs. xi. 38.

(v) Luke i. 69.

“ lightly esteemed. Behold, the days come that I will
 “ cut off thine arm, and the arm of thy father’s *house*,
 “ and there shall not be an old man in thine *house*. And
 “ thou shalt see an enemy in my habitation, in all the
 “ wealth which God shall give Israel: and there shall
 “ not be an old man in thine *house* forever. And the
 “ man of thine, whom I shall not cut off from mine
 “ altar, shall be to consume thine eyes and to grieve
 “ thine heart: and all the increase of thine *house* shall
 “ die in the flower of their age.” (or “ die men,”) as
 the Margin reads. (w) Here is a numerous *house* with-
 out one old man. As to these young men, the question
 is, were they in the flower of their age, when they first
 became *the increase of Eli’s house*? If so, they were
 the only instance of the kind since the days of Adam.
 Instead of “ thine *arm* and the *arm* of thy father’s
 ‘ *house*,” the Septuagint reads “ thy *seed* and the *seed*
 “ of thy father’s *house*.” With this Dr. Gill’s Commen-
 tary agrees: for he says that his *arm* means “ his *child-*
 “ *ren*, which are the strength of a man, and the sup-
 “ port of his family:” as when Jacob calls Reuben
 “ the beginning of my *strength*,” (x) the Septuagint
 calls him “ the beginning of my *children* :” and this he
 was, the moment that he was born. This arm of Eli’s
house, therefore, would have embraced his infants, if
 he had had any, and did actually, as Dr. Gill admits,
 embrace the *children* of his sons, concerning which the
 Dr. says, “ The CHILDREN they left were VERY YOUNG:”
 and if the memorable *Ichabod*, one of these *very young*
children, who was born just after the death of his father,
 had been said to join his bereaved mother in the mourn-
 ing of despair, it would have no more proved him an
 adult, than the fact that the jailer’s *house* participated
 in his joy of faith, proves them to be adults. Rachel’s
 new born son did actually participate in his mother’s an-
 guish, when she called his name BENONI, *the son of my*
sorrow; and it was perfectly consistent with the lan-

(w) 1 Sam. ii. 30—33.

(x) Gen. xlix. 3.

guage of the scriptures for his first smile to be construed into a participation of his father's joy, when he called his name BENJAMIN, *the son of my right hand*.

9. *The Patriarchal House*. In accounting for Daniel's calling Evilmerodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, when he was really his grandson, Prideaux remarks that "This is to be understood in the large sense, where-
 "in any ancestor upward is often called father, and any
 "descendant downward, son, according to the usual
 "style of Scripture." This extensive range of family-ascent and family-descent is sometimes comprehended in the *patriarchal house*. Pindar, in an address to Xenophon, calls him, and his father, and grandfather, "the (OIKOS,) *house*, thrice victor in the Olympic games."^(y) Taylor has shewn that Paul once uses *oikos* for family-ascent. "If any widow have children or *grandchildren*, [as my Opponent justly renders it,] let them learn first to shew piety to their own OIKOS, *house*, and to requite their *progenitors* ;"^(z) which are *their own house*. It more generally means family-descent. Lycophron calls the adulterer, "OIKOPHTHORON, *a corrupter of houses*;" and Ignatius, writing to the Ephesians, says that "HOI OIKOPHTHOROI, *corrupters of houses*, shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Houses are evidently thus corrupted by the introduction of illegitimate infants: for, as Taylor, (from whom these cases are borrowed,) observes, the adulterer is "not merely the seducer of wives, but
 "the corrupter of the *blood*, of the *family-descent*, by
 "introducing a spurious brood."^(a) This is a prominent feature in the definitions of a *house*, which the same author has given us from Aristotle and Cicero. The former says, "A *house* is a society connected together according to the course of nature, for long continuance."^(b) To this *long continuance* Cicero adds the relation of affinity, which the Old Testament recognizes in the daughters-in-law of the *house* of Noah, and which

(y) 2d edition of Taylor's Facts and Evidences, p. 33.

(z) 1 Tim. v. 4.

(a) Taylor's 2d Ed. of Facts & Evid. p. 33.

(b) Facts and Evid. 1st Ed. p. 131.

the New Testament recognizes in the *house* divided against itself, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.(c) There is also a very express scriptural recognition of Aristotle's idea of *long continuance*, in one of David's prayers. "Therefore now let it please thee to
 "bless the *house* of thy servant, that it may *continue* for
 "ever before thee: for thou, O Lord God, hast spoken
 "it, and with thy blessing let the house of thy servant
 "be blessed for ever."(d) The long continuance of David's *house* is implied even in the threat, "Now, therefore, the sword shall never depart from thy *house*."(e) Dr. Gill says that this was fulfilled in the slaughter of "*his posterity*, through their wars with the children of Israel and other nations." It has already been shewn, under a former particular, that *his posterity* numbered many infants which were devoured by the sword. These infants, then, belonged to his *house*. According to this plan, of visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation of them that hate him,(f) he punished the posterity of polluted Ham, in the line of Canaan.(g) Not only so, but with the pious patriarchs, God *blessed* their houses also; as may be seen in "the *house* of Jacob, which came into Egypt."(h) This house consisted of seventy souls, including many *infants*. To his father, Joseph says, "There will I nourish thee, (for yet there are five years of famine,) lest thou, and thy *household*, and all that thou hast, come to poverty."(i) Here the Septuagint does not use the word *oikos*, but other Greek Translators do, as Trommius informs us, and Gill informs us that his *household* here means "*his whole posterity*;" which certainly embraces *infants*. Upwards of seventy years after this, the Patriarch Ephraim, the son of Joseph, lost a son and three grandsons by the sword of certain plunderers from Gath; subsequent to which mournful loss, his wife "bare a son, and he called his name

(c) Facts and Evid. 2nd Ed. p. 34.

(d) 2 Sam. vii. 29.

(f) Ex. xx. 5.

(h) Gen. xlvi. 27. 31.

(e) 2 Sam. xii. 10.

(g) Gen. ix. 22—25.

(i) Gen. xlv. 11.

Beriah, because it went evil with his *house*.”(j) Gill observes that this infant “in some measure made up for the loss he had sustained,” in his *house*: then of course this child must belong to his *house*, as soon as he comes into the world. So, as soon as Joseph the reputed father of Jesus was born, he “was of the *house* and lineage of “David.”(k) But Christ was said to be “in the *house* of his servant David,”(l) before he was born; “He being now conceived by a virgin of his *house*,” as Dr. Gill observes.

10. *The Domestic House*. Here we find the *households* of Lydia and the jailer, which have been the innocent occasion of so much dispute. Along with these, Dr. Gill reckons the house of Zaccheus, concerning which our Saviour says, “This day is salvation come to this *house*.”(m) [that is, “to the inhabitants of this *house* ;” as Dr. Gill informs us the Arabic Version renders it.] On this passage the Dr. says, “Sometimes the Lord takes one of a city, and two of a family; and sometimes whole families, as Lydia’s and the jailer’s, and here Zaccheus’s, as seems probable.” In this controversy, it is of no great importance whether, on the one hand, we lose Stephanas, upon the authority of some Greek writers,(n) who believe him to be the jailer, removed from Philippi to Corinth; or whether, on the other hand, we gain Fortunatus and Achaicus, upon the authority of some Greek manuscripts and the Vulgate, which associate these names and their *houses* with “the *house* of Stephanas,” as the Apostle’s “first fruits of Achaia.”(o) In the same church, the Apostle baptized Crispus and Gaius,(p) without telling us whether they baptized their *households*, or whether they had any or not. With respect to Crispus the defect is made up by another writer, who informs us that he had a large *household*.(q) But even then it is not mentioned

(j) 1 Chr. vii. 23. (c. 21. 22.)

(k) Luke ii. 4. The same may be said of Mary. Luke i. 27.

(l) Luke i. 69.

(m) Luke xix. 9.

(n) Asserted by Dr. Gill on 1 Cor. i. 16.

(o) 1 Cor. xvi. 15. & Gill there.

(p) 1 Cor. i. 14.

(q) Acts xviii. 8.

that the *household* was baptized. Of this, however, there can be no doubt, since there is the same reason for baptizing his *house* that there is for baptizing the jailer's; and the baptism of "many of the Corinthians" is mentioned in the very same sentence. There is reason to believe that these "Many" were composed of whole *houses* and separate individuals; and that this was not applicable to Corinth only, but that this gospel ordinance followed the gospel itself, which, as Clemens Alexandrinus says, "Spread itself over the whole world, converting equally Greeks and Barbarians, in every nation and village, and in all cities, whole *houses* and separate individuals."(r)

To prove that the Apostles practised *household* baptism, it is not necessary to find a multiplicity of instances in scripture. If many cases of *household* baptism be necessary to prove apostolical practice, then many cases of female communion are as necessary to prove apostolical practice. But if such evidence be requisite, we shall not only have to relinquish female communion, as an apostolical practice, but we must give up even male communion also, since there are not as many recorded cases of male communion as there are of *household* baptism.

Neither is it necessary to have a minute detail of names and ages in a household, to ascertain the presence of infants, since this is implied in the very word itself. On this subject my Opponent reasons as follows, viz. "So long as the word *family*, which you say is the meaning of *oikos*, frequently denotes all that live under one father, mother, master, or mistress, whether infants or adults, so long it remains to be determined, from the circumstances of the case, who are the constituents or members of the family; and thus after all your boasted discovery, you have to confess yourselves to be just where you were; unable to prove that there was an infant in any *house*, *οικια*, or *family*

“ that was baptized.”(s) The amount of this reasoning of my Anabaptist Opponent, is as follows ; A *house* or family embraces adults and infants : Therefore, when we are told that a *house* or *family* is baptized, we are to understand that there are no infants in it, unless there is additional proof of this fact!! But if a *house* embrace adults and infants alike, why is additional proof required for one, and not for the other ? To be consistent, he ought to reason as follows ; A *house* or *family* includes adults and infants : Therefore, when we are told, even by infallible testimony, that a *house* or *family* is baptized, this is no proof that there was a baptism of either adults or infants, unless there is additional evidence of one or the other, or both!! So in relation to the other ordinance. The word *disciples* embraces males and females : Therefore, when we are told that disciples communed, we are not to understand that females communed, or males either, without additional evidence!!

To shew the absurdity of this, let us see how it will affect what Dr. Judson, the Baptist missionary to India, has said about *houses*, in his journal of Nov. 11, 1822. It is as follows, viz. “ Understand that, according to “ the public registers, 40,000 *houses* have removed from “ Ah-mah-rah-pore to Ava the new capital, and that “ 30,000 remain. The Burmans reckon ten persons, “ great and small, to a *house*, which gives 700,000, for “ the whole population of the metropolis of Burmah.”(t) Now I ask, Is any additional proof necessary to shew that half of the persons included in these 70,000 *houses* were of the age to which infant baptism is administered. But suppose that they had all renounced Paganism and embraced Judaism ; and Dr. Judson had told us that 70,000 *houses* were circumcised : would this alter the case ? Suppose again, that this Baptist missionary had proselyted them all to Christianity, and had told us that

(s) Spurious Deb. with me. p. 282. Note.

(t) Missionary Herald, Vol. 19. p. 392.

70,000 *houses*; reckoning “ten persons, great and small, to a *house*,” had been baptized by his hands; could any one doubt that he had turned Pedobaptist again? But the very “circumstances of the case,” which my Opponent demands, are found here, in the Christianizing of Jews, who are accustomed to introducing infants into the church. Yet these circumstances were found in the *household*-baptism of the New Testament, which, as we have shewn, was taken from the *household*-circumcision of the Jews.

When Dr. Judson found the jails of modern Asia furnished with tanks of water, he gave it instead of proof that the jailer of ancient Europe was immersed. It would be much more reasonable for him to have said that as the modern Asiatics “reckon ten persons, great and small, to a *house*,” therefore the baptized *houses* of the ancient Asiatics included infants.

We do not, however, depend upon modern usage, for the doctrine that a *household* includes infants. This appears to have been the general understanding, at least as far back as the time of Boaz, the great-grand-father of David. When this pious man called upon his countrymen to attest his marriage with Ruth, “All the people that were in the gate, and the elders, said, We are witnesses. The Lord make the woman that is come into thine house like Rachel and like Leah, which two did *build the house* of Israel; and do thou worthily in Ephratah, and be famous in Beth-lehem: and let thy *house* be as the *house* of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah, *of the seed* which the Lord shall give thee of this young woman. So Boaz took Ruth, and she was his wife: and when he went in unto her, the Lord gave her conception, and she bare a son.”(u) How did Rachel and Leah *build the house* of Israel? By giving him infants. What sort of a *house* was the *house* of Pharez? One which rapidly increased

(u) Ruth iv. 11—13.

by the accession of numerous infants. Of what materials did these friends and witnesses wish the house of Boaz built, that it might resemble that of Pharez? "*Of the seed*, [the infant offspring,] which the Lord shall give thee of this young woman." And how was his house built in fact? "She bare a son." And, as Taylor has already reminded us, this passage shews, that the meaning here attached to the word *house*, was familiar to "all the people that were in the gate, and the elders." To consider the word *house*, as embracing *infants*, was then common to civil courts and ordinary conversation: and from the manner in which they refer to their ancestors, they evidently considered this the meaning attached to the word, by the earliest patriarchs, and in the very first book of Moses. To this very passage of Ruth, Dr. Gill refers, in illustration of our Marginal rendering of Gen. xvi. 2, where Sarai, after giving her handmaid to Abram, says, "It may be that I may *be builded* by her." On this text the Doctor says, "For women, by bearing children, *build up an* HOUSE, see Ruth iv. 11, hence a "*son*, in Hebrew, is called BEN, from BANAH, *to build*."

Other passages of scripture giving it the same signification, are numerous. "God setteth the solitary in a *house*;"(v) that is, in a family of children. "He maketh the barren woman to dwell in an *house*, and to be a joyful mother of *children*."(w) As Achan and his family perished together;(x) and as the sons of Zedekiah were slain before his eyes;(y) so it is said of Korah and his company, "And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their *houses*, and all the men that pertained unto Korah, and all their goods."(z) Who these *houses* are, is explained in the context, "And Dathan and Abiram came out, and stood in the door of their tents, and their wives, and their sons, and *their little children*, PARVULIS SUIS," as Junius and

(v) Ps. lxxviii. 6. Hebr. LXX. & Eng. Marg.

(w) Ps. cxlii. 9. Hbr. LXX. & Eng. Marg.

(x) Josh. vii. 24. (y) Jer. xxxix. 6. (z) Num. xvi. 32. (comp. 27.)

Tremellius render it. Dr. Gill thinks it possible that houses here may mean *tents*. Not so the Septuagint: for, in the immediately preceding context, they interpolate OIKOUS and SKENAS, *houses* and *tents*.^(a) There is an instance now before me, in which both these words include the family. “And thou shalt know that thy *tabernacle* shall be in peace; and thou shalt visit thy *habitation*, and shalt not sin.”^(b) The word *tabernacle* here, which Dr. Gill says, “includes all that dwell in his *house*, his family,” is OIKOS, *house*, in the Septuagint. The word *habitation* “including his family also,” as Dr. Gill says, is SKENE, *tent*, in the Septuagint.

The very great frequency with which infants are connected with their parents in the domestic *house* of the scriptures, looks so much like the spirit of Pedobaptism, that Dr. Gill sometimes makes a fruitless attempt to escape this consequence. The following text is an example. “The wicked are overthrown and are not; but the *house* of the righteous shall stand.”^(c) The Doctor denies that *house* here means “*family*, as the “generality of interpreters, for the *family* of the righteous may be extinct, and especially not continue as “righteous.” The same reason might be given for “contradicting the inspired declaration of Peter, “The promise is unto you and to your *children*.”^(d) But Dr. Gill cannot continue such a strain uniformly. When Solomon says, “Through wisdom is an *house* builded; and by understanding it is established;” the Doctor’s Commentary says, “The prosperity of a man’s *family* is continued and secured by his prudent conduct.”

In case of Esther’s refusal to act for the Jews, Mordecai’s denunciation was “Thou and thy father’s *house* shall be destroyed.”^(e) When it is said in Job, “The increase of his *house* shall depart,”^(f) Gill says, “Either his *children* or his substance.” Compare this with the prophecy, “Then will I build you, and not pull you

(a) Verse 30.
(d) Acts ii. 39.

(b) Job v. 24.
(e) Esth. iv. 14.

(c) Prov. xii. 7.
(f) Job xx. 28.

down ;”(g) which, Gill says, is a promise of “ *increase in numbers, wealth and riches.*” It is by the birth of children that a *house* is built up or increased in numbers. These are also embraced in the promise of Saul to the man who should slay Goliath ; that he would “ make his father’s *house* free in Israel.”(h) Also, in the prayer which our Saviour directed the apostles to make, “ Peace be to this *house.*”(i)

In the following half dozen instances, Gill considers the word *house* as equivalent to *family*, and neither he nor any other will probably deny that *infants* are included. The people are required to support the priest, “ that the blessing may rest in thine house.”(o) “ And the Lord blessed Obed-edom and all his *household.*”(p) “ And thou shalt rejoice in every good thing which the Lord thy God hath given unto thee and unto thine *house.*”(q) “ Therefore now let it please thee to bless the *house* of thy servant.” “ And with thy blessing let the *house* of thy servant be blessed for ever.”(r) “ And all the people departed every man to his house, and David returned to bless his *house.*”(s) “ Woe to him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his *house.*”(t)

When it is said again, “ Then David returned to bless his *household.*”(u) Gill says, “ his wife, *children* and servants.” When it is said that “ Esau took his wives, and his *sons*, and his *daughters*, and all the persons of his *house,*”(v) Gill interprets, “ his men-servants and maid-servants that were *born in his house*, or bought with his money.” When Jacob “ had a *large family* to provide for.” as Gill observes, then he said to Laban, “ When shall I provide for mine own *house* also?”(w) When the prophet tells us that wick-

(g) Jer. xlii. 10.

(i) Luke x. 5.

(h) 2 Sam. vi. 11.

(r) 2 Sam. vii. 29.

(t) Habb. ii. 9.

(v) Gen. xxxvi. 6.

(h) 1 Sam. xvii. 25.

(o) Ez. xlv. 30.

(q) Deut. xxvi. 11.

(s) 1 Chr. xvi. 43.

(u) 2 Sam. vi. 20.

(w) Gen. xxx. 30.

ed governours “oppress a man and his *house*,”(x) Dr. Gill interprets that they “distressed a man and his *family* for the present, and his posterity after him. My Opponent’s New Testament reads, “By intestine broils “any kingdom may be desolated, one *family* (*house*) “falling after another [*house*.]”(y) If these *families* had no infants, they would come to desolation without intestine broils. No doubt my Opponent will admit that they may generally have infants, as there is nothing said about their baptism. But suppose the text to read in this way; “By the Spirit and ordinances of God, any “kingdom may be Christianized, one *family* being baptized after another.” How sadly that would alter the case. All the infants in the realm would immediately disappear, like those of Lydia, Stephanas, and the jailer; and the Moloch of Anabaptism would make it as desolate in a moment, as intestine broils could make it in many years. If, after this devastation, more general than that of Pharaoh or Herod; if while every subject was mourning, like Ephraim, that “it went evil with his “*house*,”(z) Providence should give to each a *Beriah*, as he did to that venerable Patriarch, then it may be said of this infant son in every family, as Dr. Gill said of Beriah the son of Ephraim, that he “in some measure “made up for the loss he had sustained” in his *house*.

When the wise man says, “Every wise woman buildeth her *house*,”(a) Gill understands that she does it not only by her piety, prudence, and industry; but “by her fruitfulness, as Leah and Rachel built up the “*house* of Israel.” When it is said, “She looketh “well to the ways of her *household*,”(b) Gill considers it as meaning “her *children* and servants.” When it is said of this wise woman, that “She giveth meat to her “*household*,”(c) Gill, in spiritualizing the passage, makes *household* to include *children* and *babes*. Paul says that a bishop must be “One that ruleth well his

(x) Mic. ii. 2.

(z) 1 Chr. vii. 23.

(b) Prov. xxxi. 27

(y) Luke xi. 17.

(a) Prov. xiv. 1.

(c) Prov. xxxi. 15.

“own *house*, having his *children* in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to rule his own *house*, how shall he take care of the church of God?” “Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their *children* and their own *houses* well.”(d) These *houses* Gill considers as embracing “the *family*, wife, *children* and servants.”

Sometimes Moses directs the priests to eat the sacrifices with their sons and daughters, all of which are infants before they are adults; and frequently he says, “Every one that is clean in thy *house* shall eat of it.”(j) Gill says, “Their families, wives, *children*, and servants.” While they eat together God says, “Thou shalt rejoice, thou, and thine *household*.”(k) According to Gill, this requires that they should “eat their food with cheerfulness and gladness, making a feast of it, and keeping it as such, he and his *whole family*, his wife and *children*, or as many as were with him.” That the households here meant, embraced myriads of infants, no one will deny. A question might arise, Would the number of these infants be in the least diminished, if, in both passages, we were to add the words, “believing in God,” which have stumbled so many, in the baptism of the jailer’s household? The addition of the words will not make the least difference in the sense, because without faith it is impossible to please God by eating and rejoicing. “Every one that is clean in thy *house* shall eat of it, [believing in God.]” “Thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine *household* [believing in God.]” If the fact, that the command *implies* this much, does not exclude infants, would the *expression* of the words exclude them? The scriptures condemn him, “who eateth not of faith,”(l) They also say, “If any would not work, neither should he eat.”(m) Because infants cannot believe or work, are they to be excluded

(d) 1 Tim. iii. 4. 5. 12.

(j) Lev. x. 14. Num. xviii. 11. 13. 31. Deut. xv. 20.

(k) Deut. xiv. 26.

(l) Rom. xiv. 23.

(m) 2 Thess. iii. 10.

from eating? But if *precepts* and *prohibitions* concerning faith do not extend to infants, as far as faith is concerned, why may not this hold true with regard to *narratives*?

Yet it is not admitted that the narrative of the jailer is encumbered with this difficulty, except with those who misunderstood our translation. The jailer "rejoiced, "believing in God with all his *house*." This, it is confessed, affords some pretext for attributing faith to the jailer's *house*: yet I could soon point you to a passage which no one misunderstands, and which the collocation of our Translators has made much more liable to perversion. It is the following. "For he hath made *him* to be "sin for *us*, *who* knew no sin."⁽ⁿ⁾ Is it Christ or ourselves who knew no sin? To give a correct answer, the relative, *who* in our Translation, must not be allowed to refer to the last antecedent, as in common cases. My Opponent's favourite Thomson of our own country, has placed the relative by its proper antecedent. "For he "hath made *him who* knew no sin, a sin offering for *us*." In this he follows the great body of the European translators, who themselves follow the Latin Vulgate and the Greek Original. "For *him who* knew no sin, he hath "made sin (or a sin offering) for *us*." This is the order in which the Greek and Latin words stand, as far as the pronouns in question are concerned; and it seems strange that our Translators should alter this order, when it could have no other effect than to obscure the sense.

The great difficulty in the narrative of the jailer, arises from a similar misplacing of words. In this text, DE SACY, the Roman Catholic Translator, has hit the meaning more obviously, by more closely following the order of the original: "*Et il se rejouit avec toute sa "maison croyant en Dieu*: And he rejoiced with all "his house believing in God." In this he follows the ancient Latin Vulgate "*Et lætatus est cum omni domo sua credens deo*: And he rejoiced with all his house be-

(n) 2 Cor. v. 21.

believing in God." Such is the construction of these languages, as to make the word, *believing*, applicable to the jailer only. These translations strictly follow the Original in arrangement and sense. "και ηγαλλιασατο" "πανοιχι πεπιστευως τω Θεω:" and he rejoiced with all his house believing in God." The meaning of it is evidently this, that "He, believing in God, rejoiced with all his house." The Apostle commanded him to believe, and promised that he and his house should be saved. Accordingly he did believe, "and was baptized, he and all his straightway." And it was no more difficult for his infant household to catch the infection of his joy, than for the children of the Jewish priests to rejoice with them as mentioned above, on the text, "Thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household."

But if the sacred writer had expressly said that the converted jailer had a *believing household*, or "*faithful children*," as Paul requires that bishops or elders should have, it would have been no certain evidence that these infants were converted. Whether I can give you a satisfactory reason for this or not, I shall endeavour to support the position. The Apostle says, "If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having *faithful children*,"(e) then they may be bishops or elders. Now if these *faithfuls* are intelligent *converts*, then converted children are a necessary qualification for the ministerial office; and that man who has an infant incapable of faith, is not fit for this office. This is too absurd. Dr. Gill, therefore, says, "By *faithful children* cannot be meant "*converted ones*, or *true believers* in Christ; for it is not "in the power of men to make their children such; and "their not being so can never be an objection to their "being elders, if otherwise qualified. At most, the "phrase can only intend, that they should be brought "up in *the faith*, in the principles, doctrines, and ways "of Christianity, or in the nurture and admonition of "the Lord." The Doctor's "*At most*," though a lit-

(e) Tit. i. 6.

tle short of the mark, is much better than an interpretation which he had offered a few lines before. There he says that these *faithful children* meant “*Legitimate* ones, born in lawful wedlock ;” and adds, that it is, “in the same sense as such are called *godly* and *holy*, in Mal. ii. 15. 1 Cor. vii. 14.” In the second Point of the fifth Proposition of my first Argument, it was shewn that the word *holy*, in 1 Cor. vii. 14, did not mean *legitimate* ; and you were reminded that the Baptists of the present day are inclined to relinquish this interpretation. We need not occupy your time, in refuting the notion that *faithful* means *legitimate*, since neither Doctor Gill, nor, as far as I know, any other human being, has ever attempted to prove it. There is no more evidence that the *legitimacy* of the elder’s children is here intended, than there is, that the jailer and his children rejoiced in their *legitimacy*. But the Doctor has given us a part of the truth, when he says that these *faithfuls* are such as “should be brought up *in the faith*, in the principles, doctrines, and ways of Christianity, or in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” This is admitting, that, according to Scripture, infants may be called *faithfuls*, because their parents are bound to *bring them up in the faith*. As parents formally recognize this obligation, in the baptism of their children, why not say at once, that unconscious infants may be called *faithfuls*, when they are *baptized*? This would be the whole truth, as it was held by the ancient church, unsophisticated by modern Anabaptism. “Theodoret, Oecumenius, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and all the Greek Scholiasts,” as reported by Taylor, call certain New Testament families “*Faithfuls*,” not because they were all *believers*, or capable of believing, but because they were “*baptized families*.”(f) Augustin, as reported by Wall, tells Boniface, that “An infant, though he be not yet “constituted a *faithful*, by that *faith* which consists in “the will of *believers* ; is yet [constituted a *faithful*,]

(f) Baptists Self-convicted. p. 39.

“ by the *sacrament of that faith* : for as he is said to *believe*, so he is called a *faithful*, not from his having the thing itself in his mind, but from his receiving the *sacrament of it*.”(g) According to Dr. Gill, an infant may be called a *faithful* in the Scriptures, because he should be brought up in the *faith* ; but, according to the ancient church, an infant is called a *faithful*, because he receives the *sacrament of faith*, in *baptism*. Admitting, then, that the jailer’s *household* is said to *believe*, (which is not the fact,) still these interpretations would place them where they ought to be.

In the case of Lydia,(h) there is nothing said about any one being *faithful* except herself. “If ye have judged me to be *faithful* to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there.” This would be a strange invitation for one to give, who had not a settled abode there herself, as some insinuate, but was only a travelling adventurer. That it was her fixed residence, appears, from her occupation in a wealthy line of business, and from her being able to entertain four missionaries for an indefinite time. That there were four in company, is plain from the context. The beginning of the chapter informs us, that Paul found Timothy at Lystra, and that he took him on this expedition. In the very text which records the baptism, Luke, the author of the narrative, associates himself with them, and in the 19th verse, Silas is placed in the same company. Of these four persons, only two, Paul and Silas, were dragged to prison ;(i) leaving the other two, Timothy and Luke, still in the house of Lydia ; whither the prisoners returned to comfort, not to baptize them, as soon as they obtained their liberty. “And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia : and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them and departed ;”(j) leaving them, as is thought, still in the house of Lydia, to organize and nourish the Philippian church.

(g) Wall’s Hist. of Bap. Book 1. Chap. 15. Sect. 4. Subsect. 4.

(h) Acts xvi.

(i) Verses 19. 25. 29.

(j) Verse 40.

But although Lydia was pleased with the company of these *brethren*, the Baptists appear to wish that they had sought other quarters. It will not do to say that Timothy and Luke were the *household* of Lydia, which Paul baptized : and yet they try to believe that the *household* which was baptized, and the *brethren* who were comforted, were the same persons ; and adults, of course. They, therefore, wish you to believe that Lydia's servants and grown children were her *household*, and that her grown children and servants and other adult converts were the *brethren* whom Paul and Silas comforted. This, however, is conjecture, without evidence, and against evidence. It is without evidence, because this adult assembly of children, servants, and other Philippian converts at Lydia's house, is no where recorded nor hinted at, except in uninspired conjectures, and those, it appears, of a modern date. It is against evidence ; because the inspired record furnishes us with the names of the *brethren* whom Paul and Silas comforted at Lydia's house, while the whole tenor of the narrative marks the absence of adults in her baptized *household*. It is quite possible that after they had been for some time under the influence of Christian prayers, instruction, and example, this household became as worthy of notice, as that of Stephanas, which, though baptized on the father's profession, was afterwards commended for ministering to the saints, according to their age, ability, and opportunity. Much more would this commendation have been deserved and received, if, instead of being promising children, Lydia's *household* had consisted of converted adults. If such had been the case, how natural would it have been, for the historian to tell us that Lydia's *household*, as well as herself, resorted to the sea shore to worship ; that the Lord opened *their* hearts as well as *hers* ; that they, as well as she, attended to the things which were spoken of Paul ; that they, as well as she, were faithful to the Lord ; and that for this reason, they joined her in beseeching, and aided her in constraining Paul and his companions to enter their common resi-

dence. How different the account which the sacred writer has given ! If it were not for baptism, we should never have known that she had a *household*. They are never once mentioned, except in receiving this ordinance with her. It is Lydia alone who resorts to the sea-shore ; Lydia alone whose heart is opened ; Lydia alone who attends to Paul's preaching ; Lydia alone who is faithful to the Lord ; she alone *beseeches* the preachers to visit her ; and she alone *constrains* them to enter her house. But "*She was baptized, and her household!*" and thus proves *household* baptism to be *infant* baptism.

VI.

HOLOS OIKOS.

This appears to be generally considered as synonymous with *pas oikos*. Accordingly, while Luke points out the household of Cornelius by the latter phrase, Eusebius describes it by the former.^(k) It will not be denied that when Baasha "smote the *whole house* of Jeroboam,"^(l) there were some children in that *house*. Nor will this be denied in another instance ; where it is said that Zimri "slew the *whole house* of Baasha :"^(m) where Dr. Gill says, that it means "*his whole family, all the children that he had,*" "*that not only his posterity, but*" "*all any way related to him should be cut off.*" When Paul says, that "*Moses verily was faithful in his whole house, as a servant,*"⁽ⁿ⁾ Gill properly understands this whole house to mean the Old Testament church, which had millions of infants. Yet when the same Apostle says, that certain deceivers of his day "*subvert whole houses,*"^(o) the Baptists answer, that "*whole houses* could not be *subverted*, unless they had first been *converted* ;" and, taking it for granted that no infant can be said to *believe* or *be converted*, they would have us con-

(k) Acts x. 2. See Taylor's "Baptists Self-convicted," p. 41, Note.

(l) 1 Kings xv. 29. (m) 1 Kings xvi. 11. 12. where this is twice said.

(n) Hebr. iii. 2. 5. where this is twice said.

(o) Tit. i. 11.

clude that these *whole houses*, *subverted* by false teachers, were composed of *adult converts*, instead of *unbelieving* and *unconverted infants*. And so they think of the family of Crispus, when it is said, that “Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, *believed* on the Lord, with his *whole house*.”^(p) But to this it is answered that this baptism of believers, each on his own profession, would not be called *household* baptism, but the baptism of separate individuals.

This distinction was expressly recognized among the Greek and Latin Fathers, who certainly had some acquaintance with the Greek language. Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived in the second century, says, “The doctrine of the Master of Christianity did not remain confined to Judea only, as the philosophy of the Greeks was confined to Greece: but it spread itself over the whole world, *converting* equally Greeks and Barbarians, in every nation and village, and in all cities, *whole houses*, and *separate individuals*.”^(q) Here we find that *separate individuals*, making a personal profession, are distinguished from *whole houses*, embracing infants incapable of this profession: yet both are said to be *converted*. How this was understood, before the refinements of Anabaptism perplexed the church, may be learned from a passage of Augustine, which has, if I mistake not, been quoted in relation to the jailer’s household. His words are as follows, viz. “When an infant that has not yet the faculty of *faith*, is said to *believe*, he is said to have *faith*, because of [baptism] *the sacrament of faith*; and to be *converted* (CONVERTERE SE) to God, because of [baptism] *the sacrament of conversion*.” And so an infant, though he be not yet constituted a *believer*, by that *faith* which consists in the will of *believers*, yet he is, by [baptism] *the sacrament of that faith*; for as he is said to *believe*, so he is called a

(p) Acts xviii. 8. (q) οἶκος ὅλους καὶ ἰδια ἑαζον. Taylor’s *Facts and Evidences*, first edition, London 1818, p. 116. Second edition, London, 1819, p. 106.

“ *believer*, not from his having *the thing itself* in his
 “ mind, but from his receiving [baptism] the *sacrament*
 “ *of it.*”(r)

Let it not be said that this is giving human authority in divine things. This common-sense understanding which the church of God has always had of the subject, has already been shewn to be founded upon the infallible word. Remember that children are there declared to have entered into covenant; and, certainly, faith and conversion may be ascribed to them as correctly as covenant-making, and they are ascribed to them in the same sense, as the Fathers, just now quoted, have explained. If this language may not be used, concerning infants, on account of their participation in the external ordinances of religion, I should like to know what the Baptists would make of a passage of scripture, in which such language is applied to irrational domestic animals, on account of their participation in the privations of a public fast. The proclamation of the king of Nineveh says, “ Let
 “ man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry
 “ mightily unto God: yea, let them be *converted* every
 “ one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands.”(s) The word *converted* is here used, because, that is the force of the Original and of all our translations, and is expressly used by the ancient Latin Vulgate, which reads *convertatur*; as a modern French Bible reads, “ *que chacun se convertisse* ;” the very phraseology used by Augustine, when he said that it is possible for infants “ *CONVERTERE SE; to convert themselves, or be converted,*” in a certain sense, by receiving the sacrament of conversion. These, then, belonged to the *whole house* of Crispus, and the *whole houses* which were *subverted* by false teachers.

(r) Wall's History of Baptism, Book 1. Chap. 15. Sect. 5. Subsect. 4.

(s) Jon. iii. 8.

VII.

PANOIKESIA.

In the use of this word, Thucidides speaks as follows, viz. “In the manner above mentioned, were the Athenians, for a long series of time, scattered about the country, in towns and communities, at their own discretion. And as not only the more ancient, but even the latter Athenians, quite down to the present war, had still retained the custom of dwelling about the country PANOIKESIA, *with their whole households.*”(t) In this place, *panoikesia* is used to include the millions of children, which are born to a whole nation, in many successive generations.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, uses the same word in the same meaning, in the following passage, viz. “And very great numbers removed, PANOIKESIA, *with their whole households*, some of whom returned when the affairs of the city were composed: but others remained where they were.”(u)

The same writer says, “And by this usage they forced those who were unable to bear it, to leave the country, with their wives and children, and to take refuge in the neighbouring cities . . . but the greatest part also of these had removed, PANOIKESIA, *with their whole households*, and leaving their [dwelling-] houses empty, lived in the country.”(v)

Thucidides uses the word to embrace all the infants of Greece in general. He says, “How horrible will it seem for Platea to be destroyed by Lacedaemonians! —that your fathers inscribed the city on the tripod of Delphos, in justice to its merits;—and that, to satisfy the Thebans, you expunged it, *εκ παντος του Ελληνικου πανοικησια*, *from all the whole household of Greece.*”(w)

(t) Taylor’s “Baptists self-convicted.” p. 49.

(u) Do. p. 48.

(v) Do. p. 49.

(w) Do. p. 49.

From the speeches, which, for historic effect, are put into the mouths of the seven celebrated Maccabean brothers, one would suppose that none of them were infants: yet “this family appears by the history to have “consisted of sons from under the age of eighteen, to “about three years old; that is, lately weaned.” Gregory Nazianzen makes them say, “Let the issue be “fixed and unmoveable as to us, *πανοικεσία σεφανωθῆναι*, “that the whole household obtain the crown.”(x)

VIII.

PANOIKIOS.

According to Diodorus Siculus, the Carthaginians intended, if urged by necessity, to emigrate, in a body, to a certain island. His words are, “For they hoped, “that being masters at sea, as they then were, they “might easily, (unknown to the conquerors,) transport “themselves, *PANOIKIOUS*, with their whole households, “into that island.”(y)

In another passage, the same ancient writer explains *panoikioi* by *τεκνῶν καὶ γυναικῶν* children and wives; whom certain Roman fathers and husbands were afraid to hazard by a protracted and disorderly flight. They, therefore, “removed, *πανοικιοι*, with their whole households, “[that is their wives and children, mentioned above,] “to the neighbouring towns and villages.”(z)

There is similar evidence in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He informs us that the country of the Antemnates and Cæninenses, and the city of Crustumium were conquered by Romulus, and reduced to the rank of Roman colonies. From the two former he conveyed to Rome many volunteer emigrants, “together with their “wives and children.” In like manner, from the latter,

(x) Taylor’s “Baptists self-convicted.” p. 50 Taylor, of course, refuses to translate by the word *household*.

(y) Do. p. 46. 47. and Note.

(z) Do. p. 47.

“several brave men joined him, bringing with them considerable powers, together with *PANOIKIA*, *their whole households* ;”(a) evidently embracing their wives and *children*.

IX.

PAS OIKOS.

The angel told Cornelius to send for Peter, “who shall tell thee words, whereby thou, and *all thy house* shall be saved.”(b) The historian tells us that this was “a devout man, and one that feared God, with *all his house*.”(c) By this, Dr. Gill understands that “he brought up his family in a religious way.” From this the Dr. certainly believed that Cornelius had *children* ; and that they were included in *all his house*.

Rahab’s house in which her relatives obtained safety, Dr. Gill seems to think a figure of the church of Christ. According to him, the spies whom she entertained, “represent the ministers of the gospel, who are the “messengers of Christ and the churches.” When they directed her to bind the scarlet thread in the window, Dr. Gill considers them as preaching, by this figure, the same doctrine taught in Mk. xvi. 16. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.” Now let us see whether these typical ministers of the gospel, allowed infants to enter their figurative church, or not. Rahab’s request was, “Shew kindness unto my father’s *house*.”(d) She made no *express* stipulation about infants, because they were included in the *house* ; and to exclude them, would be as inconsistent with the religion of the Jews, as it was inconsistent with her own wishes. Accordingly, the spies said, “Thou shalt bring thy father, and thy mother, and thy brethren, and *ALL THY FATHERS*

(a) Taylor’s “Baptists self-convicted,” p. 47. 48.

(b) Acts xi. 14.

(c) Acts x. 2.

(d) Josh. ii. 12.

“HOUSEHOLD, home unto thee.”(e) It probably never entered into any one’s mind, to suppose that the children of Rahab’s connexion were excluded from this refuge ; and it ought never to have entered their mind to suppose that the children of believers were to be excluded from that visible church, of which her house is thought a figure : especially as our Saviour has required us to suffer them to come to him, declaring that of such is the visible church.

X.

PANOIKI.

Of the jailer it is said, *ἡγαλλίασατο πανοικί, πεπιστευκώς τῷ θεῷ*, *believing in God he rejoiced* WITH ALL HIS HOUSE. On this, Taylor says, “Observe, he rejoiced *panoiki* ; “but he did not believe *panoiki*. Rejoicing was an act “of the person ; believing was an act of the mind : “there is no instance known of *panoiki* being referred “to an act of the mind.”(f) He observes that as this word “is referred to bodily action, in which infants share “without volition, without understanding, or expression “of any kind, on their part, so it always signifies the “*whole*, the *entire* of a family : every individual without exception : it includes all and excludes none : for, “if a single one be excluded, the term becomes absolutely inapplicable. And this accounts for the infrequent use of it ; as it is not constantly that a whole “family resides together, or continues so combined as to “form one band, and to be capable of one and the same “individual action, the same fate, &c. at the same time. “And this, again, agrees with a young family, since the “separation of the members of a family usually takes “place, after the elder are grown up ; and if but one “be detached from the family, the term is invalidated.”(g)

(e) Josh. ii. 18.

(f) Baptists self-convicted. p. 42.

(g) Baptists self-convicted. p. 51. 52.

Among the instances collated by this able writer, there is one which appears to give peculiar countenance to this position. It is a case in which *panoiki* includes every member of the family, old and young, strong and feeble, male and female, without admitting a single exception. It is the family of Pithius the Lydian, as related by Herodotus. The faithful subject wished only his eldest son to remain at home, while all the rest, capable of bearing arms, accompanied Xerxes in the Grecian expedition. To his humble petition, the haughty tyrant made the following reply; “Infamous man! you “see me embark my ALL in this Grecian war: *myself*, “my CHILDREN, my *brothers*, my domestics, and my “friends;—how dare you, then, presume to mention “your son, you who are my slave, and whose duty is to “accompany me on this occasion, *PANOIKIE*, *with all* “*your house*, and even your wife.”(h)

Admitting the correctness of these statements in part, still an antagonist of Mr. Taylor, “argues, that the jailer’s family must have been adults, because they ‘rejoiced in God.’”(i) Yet why may not infants participate in their parents’ joy, in one religious ordinance, as well as partake of their sorrow, in another ordinance? That they do the latter is admitted by the Baptists themselves. When the prophet orders the church to assemble for a solemn fast, he says, “Gather the children, and those that suck the breast.”(j) Gill speaks of these sucklings, as those “who were involved in the common calamity and distress, were obliged to fasting, and whose “cries might affect their parents, and engage them the “more to humiliation and repentance for their sins, “which brought such miseries, not only upon themselves, but upon their *tender infants*; and they might “think their cries would move the pity and compassion “of God.” It is not at all uncommon, for the Scriptures to attribute rejoicing to bodies of men, which in-

(h) Baptists Self-convicted, p. 50.

(i) Second Edition of Facts and Evidences, p. 122.

(j) Joel ii. 16.

clude thousands and millions of infants. To save time, I pass over several instances, which are now before me.^(k) Although Dr. Gill would have it, that the babes and sucklings which rejoiced at our Saviour's coming, were adults,^(l) yet he admits, as has been shewn already, that rejoicing is attributed to literal infants, in the law of Moses, where he tells the priests to rejoice in the goodness of the Lord "unto thee and unto thine *house*."^(m) He says, "rejoice thou and thine *household*,"⁽ⁿ⁾ by which Dr. Gill understands "he and his family, his wife and *children*, or as many as are with him."

On the same subject of sacerdotal families being supported by the sacrifices and other emoluments, Josephus uses the word *panoiki*; "So that he, *PANOIKI*, *with all his house*, might eat them in the holy city."^(o) That infants are here included is absolutely certain. But to them, in company with their parents, Eusebius attributes conversion; because, as Austin said, they received the sacrament of conversion. His words are as follows, viz. "And by the same word of the gospel, many of all ranks "were converted to the worship of the God of the universe; so that at Rome itself, many who were eminent "for their riches, and for their descent, did, *PANOIKI*, "*with all their house*, and their kindred, embrace the "way of salvation."^(p) Where Moses speaks of the Israelites who went into Egypt, some ancient Greek translators, as Trommius informs us, reckon them to be, "every man, *PANOIKI*, *with all his house*."^(q) which Dr. Gill says, includes "their families, wives, *children*, "and servants."

In a rare Apocryphal book, we have an account of Ptolemy's cruel persecution of the Jews, *μετα γυναιξιν και τεκνοις*, *with their wives and children*." He forbade any one to harbour even the youngest of them, at the peril

(k) 2 Chr. xxx. 25. Ps. xcvi. 11. xcvii. 1. xiv. 7. cxlix. 2.

(l) Ps. viii. 2. Matt. xxi. 16.

(m) Deut. xxvi. 11.

(n) Deut. xiv. 26.

(o) Baptists Self-convicted, p. 44.

(p) Do. p. 52. Second Edition of Facts and Evidences, p. 105.

(q) Ex. i. 1.

of losing his own infants and all belonging to him. The following is a part of the edict. "Whoever, therefore, shall protect any one of the Jews, ἀπο γέγονον μεχρὶ νηπιου, μεχρὶ τῶν ὑπομασσιαιῶν, *from the elder to the younger, to the babes at the breast*; he shall be punished with ignominious torments, ΠΑΝΟΙΚΙ, *with all his house*:"(r) that is, the oldest and the youngest, even tender sucklings; according to a retaliation customary in those times, as already noticed in the history of Esther.(s)

The learned Editor of Calmet's Dictionary is confident in the opinion that *panoiki* designates a *numerous* family.(t) This appears to be the understanding of Eschines, who compares the Athenians, when offended, to a nest of wasps, who never cease their molestations, "until some one attack and destroy them, ΠΑΝΟΙΚΙ, *with all their house*."(u) Let it be remembered that one female wasp is the mother of ten thousand young, in a few weeks; and the Athenians had more than this number of infants in their *panoiki*. If the jailer had one for a thousand, some of them must have been infants, if he were young enough for his charge, and for the character and actions attributed to him in the inspired narrative. "If we investigate it, we shall find that he could not be an old man; but rather in the hey-day of life. His first intention after the earthquake—'he drew his sword, and would have killed himself'—is not the character of age, which usually takes events more coolly, and is much more deliberate in determination. The action is that of a fervid mind. In like manner, 'he called for lights, and sprang in:' the original well expresses the strenuous action of a robust body;—of a man in the vigour of life: here is no decrepitude, no old age, with creeping steps, forcing an attempt to advance with some rapidity: it is the vehement burst of a man in full strength: yet this

(r) 3 Macc. iii. 18. Baptists Self-convicted, p. 46. where πανοικια, but in Aldus, now before me, πανοικι.

(s) Esth. iii. 13. viii. 11.

(t) Second Ed. of Facts & Ev. Revised, p. 113. 114.

(u) Baptists Self-convicted, p. 51.

man had a *numerous* family. He appears to have been a soldier ;—soldiers seldom marry very early in life : his numerous family, then, according to nature, must have contained young children.”(v) With these he rejoiced, and with these he was baptized.

XI.

OIKODOMIA, OIKODOME, AND PASA OIKODOME.

The first of these words is used to denote spiritual edification ;(w) so also is the second, in a great measure :(x) yet even here, our doctrine is supported by analogy : for the house of the mind, whether good or bad, is built up, not only by mature thoughts, but by those which are new-born, or even not yet brought to light. James says, “ When lust hath *conceived*, it *bringeth forth* sin ; and sin, when it is finished, *bringeth forth* death.”(y) The Psalmist says, “ Behold, he *travaileth* with iniquity, and hath *conceived* mischief, and *brought forth* falsehood.”(z)

In the use of the third phrase, Paul says, “ In whom, “ PASA OIKODOME, *all the building*, fitly framed together, groweth up unto an holy temple in the Lord.”(a) Dr. Gill believes that this house “ grows by an accession “ of new stones, or of souls called by grace ;” and is destined at last to receive the whole “ number of God’s “ elect.” If, therefore, there are any elect infants ; any infants saved by grace ; then there must be an accession of infants to this building. Macknight, my Opponent’s standard, considers this building as the gospel church. Their accession to it, then, must be by baptism.

(v) 2nd Ed. of Facts & Ev. Revised, p. 114.

(w) 1 Tim. i. 4.

(x) Rom. xiv. 19. xv. 2. 2 Cor. xii. 9. 1 Cor. xiv. 3. 5. 12. 26. x. 8. xiii. 10. Eph. iv. 29. 16. 1 Cor. iii. 9. Eph. iv. 12. Job xx. 28. 2 Cor. v. 1.

(y) James i. 15. See Gill, who here quotes Kimchi on Ps. vii. 14.

(z) Ps. vii. 14. See also Prov. xix. 27. Job xv. 35. [Is. lix. 4. 13. Jer. xlix. 30. Rom. vii. 5.

(a) Eph. ii. 21.

XII.

OIKODOMEO.

The use of the verb, *to build*, may throw much light upon the present question. This word is used in relation to all the infants of “the Jewish nation, both as to church and state,” as Dr. Gill thinks, in that passage, where God says, “That which I have *built* will I break down, and that which I have planted I will pluck up, even this whole land.”(b)

Paul says, “Every *house* is *builded* by some one.” Gill says, “This is true of houses properly taken, or improperly, as nations, tribes, families, and kindred.” I would ask, How are nations, tribes, families and kindred *built*? All are willing to admit infants into such buildings. Paul says, moreover, “He that *built* all things is God.”(c) Dr. Gill understands this “of Christ, and of his *building* the church:” but there must be no infants there. Let us, however, examine this word farther, under the following particulars; as it relates to

1. *The Spiritual Building.* It is in relation to spiritual things that Paul says, “If I *build* again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.”(d) “Knowledge puffeth up, but love *buildeth up*.”(e) There are many similar instances, in which our Translators render this word by, *edify*, which is etymologically synonymous. “Edify one another.” “All things do not edify.”(f) They frequently render the Original by the word *build*, when spiritual things are ultimately intended, as Dr. Gill teaches. “For which of you intending to *build* a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it?” “This man began to build, and was not able to finish.”(g)

(b) Jer. xlv. 4.

(c) Heb. iii. 4.

(d) Gal. ii. 18.

(e) 1 Cor. viii. 1.

(f) 1 Thess. v. 11.

1 Cor. x. 23. See also

1 Cor. xiv. 17, 4. Acts ix. 31.

(g) Luke xiv. 28, 30.

A saint is likened to “a wise man, which *built* his house upon a rock.”(h) Are no infants built on this rock?

The Apostle Peter says, “Ye also, as lively stones, are *built up* a spiritual house.”(i) We have already had occasion to notice Gill’s commentary on this passage; in which he represents all men as lying *naturally* in the same quarry: but some are *graciously* dug out, “and made fit for the *spiritual building*.” If any infants are dug out of nature’s quarry, and made subjects of grace, then some infants “are built up a spiritual house.” The law of Moses ordained that the man who refused to “*build up* his brother’s house,”(j) should have his foot bared like a slave. No one doubts that literal infants are here meant. Dr. Gill says, “In the mystical sense of it, as Ainsworth observes, it spiritually signified, that such as would not beget children unto Christ, (or preach his gospel for that purpose,) it should be declared of them, that their feet are not shod with the preparation of the gospel of Christ.” Thus, whether it be literally, or spiritually understood, babes are included.

2. *The Ecclesiastical Building.* This is intimately connected with the former, as are the church visible and invisible. Even when Peter says that Christians are *built up a spiritual house*, Gill says that they, “in a “gospel church-state, become the house of God in a “*spiritual* sense.” The church is said to be a spiritual society, not as opposed to a visible society, but as distinguished from a political body. Concerning church courts, our excellent standards say, “These assemblies “ought not to possess any *civil* jurisdiction, nor to inflict any *civil* penalties. Their power is wholly “*moral* or *spiritual*, and that only ministerial and declarative.”(k) Omitting many passages which might be quoted we shall refer to a very few, and those in Jeremiah only. He says, “Again I will *build* thee, and

(h) Matt. vii. 24. 25. Luke vi. 48. 49.

(i) 1 Pet. ii. 4. 5.

(k) Form of Gov. Chap. 8. Sect. 2.

(j) Deut. xxv. 9.

thou shall be *built* ; O Virgin of Israel." "And it shall come to pass, that like as I have watched over them, to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict ; so will I watch over them *to build*, and to plant, saith the Lord."(*l*) "I will *build* you, and not pull you down."(*m*) "I will build them as at the first:"(*o*) that is, with believers and their seed. As for the Gentiles, that is, the Christian church, "They shall be *built* in the midst of my people:"(*n*) that is, engrafted on the old stock, as Paul teaches us ; and, as Dr. Gill says, "partaking of the same privileges and ordinances as the people of God." The administration of the seal of initiation to infants, was once a highly valued privilege and ordinance of the people of God. Believers scripturally demand the same privilege and ordinance now.

3. *The Domestic Building.* Here we come to the primary meaning of the law of Moses, which commands a survivor to "*build up* his brother's house."(*p*) Solomon says, "Through wisdom is an house *build*ed, and by understanding, it is established,"(*q*) that is, says Gill, "The prosperity of a man's family is continued and secured by his prudent conduct." Again, "Every wise woman *build*eth her house."(*r*) Gill says that this is done, in part, "by her fruitfulness, as Leah and Rachel built up the house of Israel." Rachel desired thus to build up the house of Israel ; and for that reason she "said unto Jacob, Give me *children*, or else I die."(*s*) Her reason for giving Billah to her husband, was "that I also *may be built* by her," as the Hebrew and our English Margin read : or "that I also *may have children* by her ;"(*t*) as the Septuagint and the English Text read. From this passage, Dr. Gill refers to a former one, in which Leah, acting the same part, says, "It may be that *I may be build*ed by her ;" according to the Margin : "It may be that *I may obtain*

(*l*) Jer. xxxi. 4. 28.(*o*) Do. xxxiii. 7(*r*) Prov. xiv. 1.(*m*) Do. xlii. 10.(*n*) Deut. xxv. 9.(*s*) Gen. xxx. 1.(*p*) Do. xii. 16.(*q*) Prov. xxiv. 3.(*t*) Do. xxx. 3.

“ *children* by her ;” (u) according to the Text : On both of which, Gill comments in the following words, viz. “ For women, by *bearing children, build up* an house, “ see Ruth iv. 11. hence *a son* in Hebrew is called BEN, “ from BANAH, *to build.*” To this same passage in Ruth, the Doctor refers concerning another of the Proverbs, which contains the command, “ *build* thine “ house ;” (v) to confirm Jarchi’s interpretation, that a man should “ take a wife, when he is able to maintain her, “ whereby his house may be *built up* ; see Ruth iv. 11.” This passage we have already discussed in the tenth Subsection of the fifth section of this Argument on Household Baptism. It was there shewn, that this phraseology was generally used and understood, as we use and understand it, by “ all the people that were in the gate, and the elders” of the Jewish nation, in the time of Boaz, the great grand father of David ; that such language with such a meaning, was common to civil courts and ordinary conversation ; and that, from the manner in which they refer to their ancestors, they evidently considered this the meaning attached to such words and phrases, by the earliest patriarchs, and in the very first book of Moses, where Dr. Gill has shewn that a new born son is called *ben*, because he forms a part of the domestic *building*, and that when women desired *children*, they expressed a hope that they might be *built up*.

We will now recall your attention to the rules of interpretation by which we were all agreed that this discussion should be conducted. I will not now repeat those which were copied from the Duke de Montausier and Thomas Hartwell Horne ; but only those which were received from the Baptist Dr. Ryland, with a view

(u) Gen. xvi. 2.

(v) Prov. xxiv. 27.

to this very controversy. They are as follows, viz. “*Every word should be taken in its primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning, unless there be something in the connexion, or in the nature of things, which requires it to be taken otherwise.*” “*Whenever, by the connexion of a term, or by the nature of things, we are obliged to depart from the primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning of a word, we should depart, as little as possible, from that meaning, and even with reluctance.*” Our object is to ascertain the meaning of the word *household*, connected with the baptism of several families in the New Testament. The question is, Does this word *household* include *infants*, as the word *disciples* includes *females*? In support of the affirmative of this question, I have, according to Dr. Ryland’s rules, and others which were quoted, proved the following statements, viz. 1. The word *household* and its cognates, embrace infants, in the “primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning” of the words.^(w) 2. In the disputed passages, there is nothing connected with the word *household*, which requires it to be taken otherwise than in its “primary, obvious, and ordinary meaning.” 3. This was the meaning of the word *household*, among those for whom the authors of the disputed passages immediately wrote. 4. This was the meaning of the word *household*, and its conjugates, in other writings of the same authors, and of contemporary authors, and of former authors, Sacred and Profane. We, therefore, conclude, legitimately, that *household* embraces *infants*, and that *household baptism* is *infant baptism*.

(w) That is, when these words are used in relation to the animate, and not the inanimate world.

As we are now closing my first Topic, *The scriptural subject of baptism*, it would not be amiss to take a very cursory review of the two arguments of which it consists; *Divine command*, and *Apostolical practice*. In support of the first argument, we established, upon a scriptural basis, the five following propositions, viz. 1. Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God. 2. The Christian church is a branch of the Abrahamic church: or, in other words, the Jewish Society before Christ, and the Christian Society after Christ, are one and the same church in different dispensations. 3. Jewish Circumcision before Christ, and Christian Baptism after Christ, are one and the same seal in *substance*, though in different *forms*. 4. The administration of this seal to infants was once enjoined by divine authority; that is, God once commanded it. 5. The administration of this seal to infants has never since been prohibited by divine authority; that is, this command of God, originally given in the Old Testament, is not repealed in the New Testament, but rather confirmed. Regardless of their own prejudices or the empty declamation of others, let my hearers examine these premises in detail; let them calmly contemplate every article, and weigh the consequence of admitting them all. There is no person of candour and intelligence who can deny, that if these propositions are true, then there is now in force, both in the Old and New Testaments, an unrepealed divine command, for administering to believers and their infants, the initiatory seal of the church, which, under the Christian dispensation, is baptism. But let it be remembered, that I have not asked you to take the premises on trust. They have been put to the most rigid test, and the more they are tried by the word of God, the more does their truth appear. We must, therefore, in good conscience, believe the inevitable conclusion from these scriptural premises, that *there is a DIVINE COMMAND for the baptism of infants*.

On the Second Argument, *Apostolical practice*, we have carefully examined the *Household Baptism* of the New Testament. To ascertain the meaning of *Oikos*, *house*, or *household*, we have patiently explored the words *Oikos*, *Oikia*, *Oikodomeo*, with their numerous conjugates, whether used in relation to the material or spiritual *house*, the ecclesiastical or celestial, the national or sectional, the royal, or pontifical, the patriarchal or domestic *house*. In this investigation we have seen, that a promise of a *house* or *household*, is a promise of *infants*;—that a *house* is given or built, repaired or increased, by the birth of *infants*;—that where good is said to be in a *house*, it is in *infants*;—that when evil is threatened or sent upon a *house*, *infants* die;—that the death of *infants* is the rolling and flowing away and destroying of a *house*;—that the moving of a *house*, is the moving of *infants*; and the establishing of a *house*, the settling of *infants*.—*Infants* have been shewn to participate in the riches and poverty of a *house*, in the joys and sorrows of a *house*, in the blessings and curses of a *house*, and in the mercies and judgments of a *house*.

——When the solitary man is set in a *house*, he is placed among *children*; and when the barren woman sits in a *house*, the meaning is, that she has an *infant* offspring.——To govern a *house*, is to govern *children*; and to provide for a *house*, is to take care of *children*.——To feed a *house*, is to feed *infants*; and when a *house* eats, *infants* eat.——According to uniform Scripture usage, the circumcision of a *house*, would mean the circumcision of *infants*; and under the teaching of God's Word and Spirit, we are compelled to believe, that *the baptism of a house or household*, is *infant baptism*. Wherefore, the proposition with which this Topic commences, is true, that “*The Scriptures consider infants as suitable, though not exclusive subjects of Christian Baptism.*”

If, then, *Infant baptism* be found in the *scriptures*, it is no “*human tradition*,” as the Challenge asserts, and as my Opponent has undertaken to prove. You

have heard and weighed his evidence. I am not aware of having unduly neglected to meet any thing of his, which deserved the name of argument. I am yet disposed to plead, *not guilty*, to the charge of observing a factitious and pernicious ordinance. May your judgments be formed by grace, according to truth and justice. As for ourselves, we feel bound to stand by our present scriptural system, in the midst of reproach and opposition, looking to the Spirit of Christ for strength, and hoping for the blessing of God upon an institution which is founded upon DIVINE COMMAND and APOSTOLICAL PRACTICE.

END OF VOL. I.

NOTICE.

The Prospectus informed the public, of the Author's reasons for publishing the first volume separately, and before the matter of the second was written out. What remains to be treated, can be seen by looking over the division in page 24. It is hoped that those who may be satisfied with the discussion of the first topic, which occupies this first volume, will be no less so with the six remaining Topics, which we hope will occupy no more than a second volume. Whether life, health, and opportunity, will be granted the Author, or not, is known to our all wise and gracious Sovereign only. His will be done. His name be glorified. The prayers of readers are requested for the writer.


I hardly know how to close this volume, without making some sort of acknowledgment, howsoever inadequate, of my obligations to Mr. Joseph P. Engles, an elder of our church, and one of the best linguists and teachers in America, for his friendship in procuring books, and revising the MS.












Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01021 4072